

THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

U. GRANT KING



Class 700.5

Book 15.5

Copyright N^o 194

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT





Sincerely Yours
W. Grant King

THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

Ulysses
BY
U. GRANT KING

Mr. Darwin deals with Material in his work on Evolution,
which is Physical or Natural growth. While we
are agreeable on this, it is only aimed here-
in to deal with Thought, which
I contend is Mental or
Spiritual growth.

The work consists mostly of the definitions of
Biblical words on a Scientific basis,
rather than a Religious theory
based principally on
belief.

The most important of these words are God and
Satan, which I argue are Thought;
that "The Soul" is Sense, and
"The Resurrection"
is Knowledge.

BOSTON

THE ROXBURGH PUBLISHING COMPANY
INCORPORATED

BR126

K52
1916



JAN 31 1917

© Cl. A 453881

no. 1.

Copyright, 1917,
By U. GRANT KING
Rights Reserved

PREFACE.

It is customary in this age to mention the parents, birth, and University schooling of a person seeking and holding high positions in the different walks of life. (What a fearful drawback custom and form are to development.) We suppose it is done with the belief that such mention in the papers about the birth, etc., will have a tendency to place said person in a higher estimation with the community at large though it ought not to do so. It reads something like this: "Mr. Smith was born at Albany, New York, of highly respected parents. His father was a Professor in the University of Michigan, and a member of different Societies. Mr. Smith graduated at Ann Arbor, and then entered the law business."

We find many who have graduated from this or that school, yet their lives have and do amount to much less than some of those who have had but a common school education; besides, it should not be considered that the former have better brains and thinking faculties because they have graduated from some University. We regret in a way that all cannot have a College or a University education, and yet such does not fit man for every occupation of greatness in life, though we are in the habit of laying, or may lay such as the foundation of the future of man. It is said "Herbert Spencer's aversion to linguistic studies put a University career

out of the question. At the age of seventeen he entered the office of Sir Charles Fox and began work as a civil engineer.

"About eight years afterward he gave up this position, and devoted the whole of his time to Scientific experiments and studies, and to contributions on philosophical questions to various periodicals." It need not be said by me that Mr. Spencer has furnished us with wonderful truths along the line of Philosophy, because those who have read his works know this. It was not because he had believed such and such was the case thru a customary teaching and belief, but because he knew from practical and experimental methods, that such and such was the actual truth concerning such things.

It is the belief of the average person, or minister, or priest, that if a person enters a Theological Seminary and studies with the "belief" that such and such is the case in regard to Truth in the Christian life of man, that such persons are better qualified for the ministry of the Actual Truth, whether experience and observation have anything to do with making it a Truth. These people generally read and study systematically, rather than compare the verse they read with what they see existing, or with their own experience of what really exists, and because of this: it SEEMS TO SAY SO AND SO in the Bible to them, and is therefore only a "belief" formed without any understanding and experience.

It is amusing to read the objections offered by priests and ministers against those who give interpretations of words written in the Bible, because

the latter have not been thru a Theological Seminary, when these same ministers and priests are supposed to receive their lessons from Jesus Christ who never entered a Seminary, nor even had a common school education. But we cannot expect anything else from such persons, when we take into consideration that the same feeling existed in the time of Jesus, by THE SAME CLASS TO-DAY. They say to-day and said then—, “Is not this the carpenter’s Son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James and Joses, and Simon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath *this man all these things?*” The italics in the quotation are mine, so as to impress you very strongly that it is the opinion of the general public and those who deal with Religion as a vocation to-day, as in those days, that no person is capable of knowing anything concerning a Spiritual Life but the graduate of some Theological Seminary.

Jesus was no scholar, but the son of a tradesman, or a “carpenter”, and should not according to the priests: know “such things” concerning a Religious life to the extent of teaching it. He was considered by the “chief priests” and so-called learned men as “beside himself”, just as all men who advance a new idea.

Most all Scientific propositions were and are considered by the majority to be the result of “unsound” thinkers, or that they are not sane ideas. The chief priests remarked as much about Jesus when they said “he is beside himself”. The Darwin theory has been looked upon by many as an “insane idea”, because it was not up to the “be-

lief" of a Religious idea, but now we find many of these same persons who are as "insane" as Darwin, since they have changed their belief for things that have been proved to be so, although contrary to their Religion. So we can consider the following remark made by Herbert Spencer as worthy of mention here, as approved by one wishing to make known, ideas that are advanced.

"Whoever hesitates to utter that which he thinks the highest truth, lest it should be too much in advance of the time, may reassure himself by looking at his acts from an impersonal point of view. Let him duly realize the fact that opinion is the agency thru which character adapts external arrangements to itself—that his opinion rightly forms part of this agency—is a unity of force, constituting, with other such units, the general power which works out social changes; and he will perceive that he may properly give full utterance to his innermost convictions: leaving it to produce what effect it may. It is not for nothing that he has in him these sympathies with some principles and repugnance to others. He, with all his capacities, and aspirations, and beliefs, is not an accident, but a product of the time. He must remember that while he is a descendant of the past, he is a parent of the future; and that his thoughts are as children born to him, which he may not carelessly let die. He, like every other man, may properly consider himself as one of the myriad agencies thru whom works the Unknown Cause; and when the Unknown Cause produces in him a certain belief, he is thereby authorized to profess and act out that belief.

"Doubtless whoever feels the greatness of the error to which his fellows cling, and the greatness of the truth which they reject, will find it hard to show due patience. It is hard to listen calmly to the futile arguments used in support of irrational doctrines, and to the misrepresentation of antagonistic doctrines. It is hard for him to bear the manifestation of that pride of ignorance which so far exceeds the pride of Science. Naturally enough such a one will be indignant when charged with irreligion because he declines to accept the carpenter-theory of creation as the most worthy one. He may think it needless as it is difficult, to concede his repugnance to a creed which tacitly ascribes to the Unknowable a love of adulation such as would be despised in a human being. Convinced as he is that all punishment, as we see it wrought out in the order of nature, is but a disguised beneficence, there will perhaps escape from him an angry condemnation of the belief that punishment is a divine vengeance, and that divine vengeance is eternal".

The people believed the priests then and now because of their Seminary training—methodical teaching and believing, yet, Nicodemus could not understand how "man must be born again". It is to point out herein that it is thru Thought that man is to be "born again", and that Nicodemus looked to a Natural impossibility instead of a Mental possibility. A great deal of time has been spent in the past twenty-three years in preparing this work, not aiming as most writers who disagree with Darwin in some respects to associate a Religious belief of creation along with that of Nat-

ural development. Having compared what it says in the Bible with experience and observation, and do know by such that "the Christ", as the Idea of Life Jesus taught is the Life to be here lived, although he too because of the early age in which he lived could not live the full meaning of the Truth. He at one time in particular was very desirous of living after the natural instead of the spiritual, but the Thought's will—"the Father's will"—of a Higher life appeared in the conscience soon after he said "let this cup pass from me", and so the will was done as far as the life of Jesus was concerned and "will be done" regardless of how you and I in the natural sense may hope to live, since it is the work of God, or Thought, to develop this as an individual, instead of the then and now natural Idea of life. The conditions of life are continually changing, irrespective of what the individual has believed, and to believe in all what Jesus said as to what concerns a life hereafter, is as unreasonable as it was for Jesus and Paul to believe even in any part of the Old Testament. Paul said, "for their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, which veil is done away in Christ." The "Old" and "New" are but the history of the lives and experience of those who lived in those days—the experience and observation causing certain prophecies to be made, and since a lower intelligence only develops by comparison to a higher intelligence, we can readily understand why each following generation is partially due to the prophecy of the former generation. The view, that remarks made in the

PREFACE

xi

Bible are contradictory is a fact, but this is because of the selfish and non-selfish view of the authors, which was natural enough, because nature excelled then more than now, only that the Spiritual then predominated in Jesus in an unusual light more than in others.

Self, or selfishness is derived from nature, and can only have its existence in the flesh, and because of nature being a part of our existence we naturally look towards a selfish view of life, or forward to a future or another life, and so the creeds as a religious body have failed to diagnose the Truth because of their own selfish view. A lie is the Truth until it is uncovered, and then another lie fills its place as the Truth, so goeth Religion. Religion is but a theory on Truth and called Scientific because of "things learnt", and naturally so "believed", instead of being believed thru experience and observation as Jesus alluded to when he said: "O ye hypocrites: Ye can discern the face of the sky: but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject under consideration is of vast importance, but no doubt is the least understood of any theme brought before the public. I shall not expect, nor even attempt to persuade all readers of these narratives to believe the same, as it could barely be expected at this period of the game, since Time is required to work out the problem of, and Perfection of Being; however, a reasonable hearing shall be asked. The subjects are treated with as much respect to other writers as my Conscience will permit, although I have not gone far beyond the thought of the most able thinkers, and if I am too aggressive to the most stereotyped religious Creeds, I am not more so to the same class as when Jesus said "O ye hypocrites".

I have only expressed myself from the experience and observation of things, as well as my own personal experience, which same Jesus went thru in order to teach what he did, as a result of this experience. It is through the above two essentials that the qualities necessary to form a Science of any Truth must come. And what is the Science of anything, but that Knowledge is duly formed by experience and observation as all Phenomena? Though Spencer was not able to see this Truth as regard to all Phenomena, he gave much in regard to it, else he would not have alluded to an "Unknown Cause", or to the "Unknowable", as I

shall herein often aim to prove is a Known Cause, or is Knowable. We have rather believed the so-called "Scientific Theory" built upon the supposition of another life distinct from this, or of what may exist in another world, as in the quotation—"literally things learnt",—believed it to be so.

Herbert Spencer says, "There has ever prevailed among men a vague notion that Scientific knowledge differs in nature from ordinary knowledge. By the Greeks, with whom mathematics—*literally things learnt*—was alone considered as knowledge proper, the distinction must have been strongly felt; and it has ever since maintained itself in the general mind. "All knowledge is from experience," holds M. Comte, and this I also hold to, hold it, indeed, in a wider sense than M. Comte,—since, not only do I believe that all the ideas transmitted by past generations are thus arrived; but I also contend that the very faculties by which they are acquired, are the products of accumulated experiences received by ancestral races of beings (see *Principles of Psychology*). Nor am I aware that M. Comte accepting this doctrine, has done anything to make it more certain, or give it more definiteness. Indeed it was impossible for him to do so, since he repudiates that part of Mental Science by which alone this doctrine can be proved."

We shall presently see that no religious theory can be the definition of Exact Truth, though it may be used as the Truth in furthering another Truth on the ground that Truth is Truth until proved to be false. But the Exact Truth as referred to in the remarks made by Jesus Christ is the Knowledge of a life that here exists, even though ref-

erence is made by him regarding another life, which, of course, is easily understood in this Scientific age of experience how it could have appeared so to him, when he, like all mankind takes the individual or selfish view of another life, because of a belief that it was and is due them for what they seem to deny themselves here.

So, the religious belief changes from one Truth to another, because built upon Theory, or "*things learnt*", and continues to ask in the words of Pilate, "What is Truth", while Truth continues to exist as a Truth regardless of a belief, and will be Known "by its fruits"—experiences in life. A great religious faith was practiced before Martin Luther stepped upon the threshold of a doctrine he too had lived and believed, but the Conscience of a God or Thought came to him in a more reasonable light than he had experienced in his former belief, and so to-day and thruout the ages, man has and is gaining a better knowledge of what the word God implies. Therefore it is only doing justice to man, that man speak according to his Conscience, rather than to uphold a theory and laws which have always worked in some degree contrary to development. Martin Luther in speaking of Conscience, said: "unless I be convinced by scripture and reason, I neither can, nor dare retract anything, for my Conscience is a captive to God's work, and it is neither safe nor right to go against Conscience." I add: this is true in the sense that God is Thought, which is Thought's work, or "God's work", and that the "Conscience" of a thing to-day may not be the Conscience of a thing in the past, if it be so that the Conscience is conscious of

a different view of life and more in harmony with development, or is evolutionary in its meaning. Judging from the immoral conditions of the world, we can see very little advancement towards a more moral state of things, although religions abound in great numbers. Nor can we say with precision that all the morality is due to the doctrines of the different religions, since man is to be awakened to the fact that he must develop with Good, or God as Thought, in order to reach a Higher State of life.

A very dear Catholic friend of mine once said: "Catholicism was the first and is the oldest religion, and why should it not be the only light to Truth?" I replied: "The candle was once the most perfect and best light for lighting purposes in the world, but to-day we have gas and electricity, and would you wish to return to and use the candle just because it was and is the 'oldest', or used before the electric came into use?" Progress is a universal law working, and while all things exist having Principles and nothing having a real existence without a known Principle, we can readily see the falsity of anything to advantage unless used as such. Anything "unknown" is no cause to an end, and can have no real existence, therefore God can only exist as it is a Known Cause. Electricity has its Principle; Mathematics has its Principle, and we must know the Principle of Mathematics, else the true example cannot be worked, and it cannot exist as a true example without its known Principle. Any "hidden" Principle is no Principle, any more than man can have a hidden character, though it may seem hidden to some.

I do not claim any original idea beyond what

some others have written in regard to heaven, but believe I have drawn away somewhat from their idea in giving the definition of God and Satan as Thought, the Soul as Sense, and the Resurrection as Knowledge. The same idea and same words are repeated herein quite often, but it is done with the aim that you may be able to understand more thoroughly, so I trust you will overlook the many repetitions, besides, they are liable to carry more weight along with the sentence wherein they are written. Neither have I confined myself to each subject throughout as a compound idea of explanation, since subjects of a different nature are a natural acquisition in drawing out to perfection each subject.

THE HICHER EVOLUTION.

GOD AND SATAN ARE THOUGHT.

“For it is God which worketh in you”, as also
it is Satan which worketh in you in opposition.

THE reason I have set out to use the Bible quotations as a forerunner to the subject and the finality of the whole, is because I believe they are significant of the Evolution of Thought from Genesis to Revelation. It is readily for me to conceive the idea, and I shall endeavor to point out the fact that Consciousness did not exist prior to Genesis, or that Genesis is “THE BEGINNING” of a State of Consciousness as to Morality and Immorality—“Good and Evil”—and as to what may be termed Thought in applying it to use as to distinguish likeness and unlikeness. But the greater point of fact to be brought out and of which the Bible quotations can be used, is because it so relates more to the life of man, and it is to confine the subject of THOUGHT to the Spiritual life of man, though thoughts of all nature and meanings may be associated in the life of man. And when I speak of the Spiritual life of man, I do not confound such a word with any future life, nor one separate from

this life, but as coexisting in this life, so I define the word Spiritual as a synonym to the word Mental, or that Spirituality is nothing but Mentality, and neither refers to an individual life, but is the individuality of the meaning of a Unity, and so not indivisible, only as an individual meaning. It is my intention to so disassociate God with Creation or as the Cause of Creation, so as to prove that God did not exist prior to Creation, and therefore is a Cause Known, instead of an "Unknown Cause", and to be Known as a Creator, or a Thought as Cause, or Cause as Thought, which could not Cause any existence known as matter, because it is not of a material nature, and, since things only can exist by what they consist, so God could not exist as the Cause of Nature. There being nothing in Nature in the likeness of God other than by MAN-ifestation of a State of Consciousness called Thought, so it can only Create things conditionally. This may appear contradictory because I have said above that things only can exist by what they consist, but God or Thought is not a thing only in the term that it is Thought, or as "Thoughts are Things" when Things are Thought. So I claim there is no such a thing as a God, other than Thought, and there is no such a thing as a Satan, other than Thought, therefore God WAS not the Cause of Creation, but IS a Cause as a Creator, or is a Re-Creator as the words of Jesus implies, "YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN". The word "again" is significant of a different Creation, or that there must have been something in the nature of being created BEFORE a thing could be created "AGAIN", and so God as Thought DERIVES ITS CAUSE

from Creation. The word "ye" as used in the sentence is significant in its meaning as applying to all generations and to the idea that man is to be born again, since no man in the then and following generations has reached the State of Perfection, or as Emerson puts it: "if John was perfect, why are you and I alive." It cannot allude to any SET OF MEN as some would have us believe because of their own selfish views, and so refers to man in all generations as that Thought which is to change not the body, but the bodily conditions of man-natural conditions pertaining to the body, and then shall exist the Perfect man as Paul says: "First that which is Natural, and AFTERWARD that which is Spiritual." Also the fact that God was not the Creator of the "NATURAL MAN", as Paul said: "Howbeit, that was not first which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural." If, according to the general opinion, and I agree that it is true that "God is a Spirit"; how in the name of Reason could Spirit Create Material things? Granting that Paul believed in a Spiritual body separate from the Material, which was easy in that generation as it is even so now, it is unreasonable that it is true, yet, his words here only signify that the Natural existed "first", and in time is to be replaced by a Spiritual and bodily condition, and that God could not exist prior to the Natural condition. It cannot be considered that the words "Man must be born again", could be so well used in addressing the public, since such would lessen the meaning as applying to "ye" in the form of man as the Spirit working, or as the Mental working. Jesus said "Behold the hour

cometh, yea, is now come that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." In other words, none of the disciples could accept the teaching and live it, because of their, or "his own" creed or doctrine, therefore is "every man scattered to his own". But why did Jesus say this? Because he knew as all men of Science know that only a few men can live the life he aimed at, or that it required time in which to put it in practice as well as to believe it possible, just as other men of Science have failed to make people believe facts they have proved to be so. The meaning of the word "alone", or Jesus as Christ was alone, was because the Spiritual or Mental Thought as God or Father was Manifested by Jesus only as regards a more spiritual life then. The word "Father" is significant of that which antedated the time of Christ as Spiritual, just as the natural father antedated the life of Jesus as physical. Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, but Christ *was* and *is* the "Son of God". The same Idea—Christ is alone and will be alone until "*all men*" are "*even as I am*", which signifies the Universal Life of the One—Christ. Here the word "Son" is but the individual meaning of a Whole or Unity called God, Father or Thought, and therefore "the Christ" as a Mental conception of life as it refers to the same where it says "I and my Father are one", and not that Jesus was any part of God, other than manifesting the seeming individuality of the Whole. There never existed a prophet so thoroughly familiar with the idea of the development of Thought

as Jesus, because he lived it almost incessantly, and by this experience, knew that the Mental life was superior to the Physical life which is to be reached thru Thought of the same.

His prophecies will be fulfilled to the letter in the Sense that the Spiritual life as the Highest form of life is the end to be reached, and we are becoming more acquainted with the exact Truth He taught and the words spoken, although many times in parables, than our progenitors. It has been thru the development of Thought thru man from the time of Genesis 3:22 that has and shall be responsible in time for the Universal Thought Manifestation. It reads,—“And the Lord God said (Man became conscious and thought so) Behold, the man is become one of us, to know Good and Evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever” (he shall have little part in life above the physical), but be as “the ground from whence he was taken.” We read in John 3:3—“Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except *a man be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” You will note here with me that it does not say, “Ye must be born again” as in another passage referred to, but, “except a man be born again”, which is in keeping with the idea I have heretofore explained, or that it does not refer to you and I as the individual living in the past or present generation, but that it will be so when the past and present material conditions shall cease to exist as Paul says,—“So when this corruptable shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then

shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

These three passages should lead us to believe that only thru the understanding of an Eternal Principle termed Thought, and the work thereof, shall man be able to reach the Perfect Idea or Christ of Life. The first thing then that confronts us, is to know the Principle, in order to commence rightly. To offer as an illustration, we will take mathematics as an example. In order to add two and two, we find there is a Principle to know, and when we have learned this, it is easy to add two and two and receive a correct answer. So also it is easy to work with God when we understand the Principle of Thought as God. Since the fundamental truth of Thought is Mental or Spiritual, it stands to reason that only the derivative can be a mental product, and in order to do this it is possible only to work thru evolutionary methods along Mental lines by associating the Higher elements of Thought in Consciousness, or to hold only the Higher Idea of Life Mentally that it will become so Visible in the Spiritual Sense. It is the general opinion of man that he should pray to God, or that there is a God to pray to, in order to overcome different things or conditions of the world, when he ought to know that a condition cannot be overcome unless that condition is changed, or it is to be changed. If you were going to add two and two, you could not conceive an answer by praying to the Principle of mathematics,—you cannot move nor change the Thought or Principle of anything by praying or even wishing it to be so, since existing conditions in regard to re-creation are the product of a living

Principle developed so. So then, in order to receive "the answer", the man must be changed through a Principle, and not by looking to that Principle. But we have lived according to, or have recognized two living Principles of Thought, and so we arrive at two conclusions, or manifest them in the form of "Good and Evil", and this is why we have believed in a God and in a Satan. "Ye are of your Father the devil", because you are of your Thought the Evil, or manifest the Evil Thought, and when "I and my Father are one", or, I and my Thought are one in regard to Good, then you manifest Good which Jesus referred to when he said, "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world, I and my Father are one". This could only allude to Thought, since any separation is individual, and, of course, would still leave a chance to conclude in a Personal God or a Creator of the Physical. Of course, the Physical is a manifestation, but is not of the Mental, since it is not Mental, but is a condition thru which the Mental manifests itself, because an act of Good or Evil could not be expressed only by form.

Spencer says, "We know nothing more of existence than a continued manifestation" which ought to convince any thinker that there can be no other existence, or that there is no "more of existence than a continued manifestation". Manifestations of Reason, Intelligence, Good and Evil, are Mental Manifestations thru the Physical, while the body Physical is the manifestation of Nature and so the existence is known of both Physical and Mental by their manifestations. What I wish to deal mostly with is the Spiritual or Mental, and

in using the terms, "You are of your Father the devil" or of this or that, may lead one to believe they are OF this or that, which is incorrect, but is a term applied in order to distinguish the individual from two effects as a result of two causes, or that they manifest one effect, as a result of one Cause, and manifest another effect as the result of another Cause and so are OF one or the other, but should not leave the impression that they are OF either as an offspring.

This would denote separation. I contend only to prove that you are the same as to either God and Satan ("Good and Evil") by *Man-ifestation*. Again: in dealing with thought we hear people say, "I thought that", when it is a fact that only the thought presented itself as to "that" or this. You never think of anything independently, but because of something which may involve that of existing conditions, or as to what may change these conditions, so you embody this thought as an individual, since, other individuals would embody these growing conditions if you did not exist as a body during the same period and location. Neither does a thought at the same time always present itself alike in two persons, because these persons are sitting at different angles at the same time. I will also argue the fact that you do not act as individual Thought as Cause, else you would be responsible hereafter for what you thought as an individual, which is contrary to the religious theory that you suffer or enjoy hereafter for what you do in this life, since you are not the Creator of either "Good and Evil". If Newton had not lived, do not imagine for a moment that "gravity" would not

have been revealed, or that Electricity would not be here if Edison did not live. Edison was just in the right position to receive this current thought of Electricity, and by constant Touch and Energy was he lead to develop the increasing power of this thought of Electricity. But it is not to dwell on thought as to things in life generally, for it is the aim only to prove that God and Satan are Good and Evil Thoughts, and Thoughts being Mental, they are both Spiritual, for it says "There are good and evil spirits". Herbert Spencer quotes Hegel by saying:

"Now, if we believe with Hegel, first, that thought is the true essence of man; second, that thought is the essence of the world, and that, therefore, there is nothing but thought; his classification beginning with the Science of pure thought may be accepted. But, otherwise, it is an obvious objection of his arrangement, that thought implies things thought of—that there can be no logical forms without the substance of experience—that the Science of things must have a simultaneous origin. Hegel, however, anticipates this objection, and, in his obstinate idealism, replies that the contrary is true; that all contained in the forms, to become something, requires to be thought of, and that logical forms are the foundations of all things.

"Mankind find themselves unable to conceive that there can be thought without things thought of. Hegel, however, asserts that there *can* be thought without things thought of. That ultimate test of a true proposition—the inability of the human mind to conceive the negation of it—which in all other cases he considers valid, he considers in-

10 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

valid where it suits his convenience to do so, and yet at the same time denies the right of an opponent to follow his example."

To take the stand that "there can be thought without things thought of", is to hold the view that thought is nothing, since, if we find things are thought, and thoughts are things, then, in the name of Reason, how can other thought exist? But I contend that thought only exists in the form of things by name created out of material in Nature, and that Nature is but a growth thru the evolutionary process of atoms coming in contact and forming things in their natural order, because Mind or Thought did not exist prior to nature, since Consciousness did not exist during the elementary states of the natural Evolution. So God or Thought as I shall argue to prove is not the Creator of the species of Nature, but develops with Nature, in a State of Consciousness in order to Re-Create man, since, Nature can only be related to the Natural Law of Evolution, while God can only be related to the Spiritual Law of Evolution. If God or Thought Created rain, etc., then Science in Astronomy is without any foundation in fact, yet thought of the same is significant that it is thought. So God is not a "FIRST CAUSE", but an existence due to development—making the Evolution of Thought simultaneous with the Evolution of organic life and so DERIVES ITS CAUSE from Creation, thereby making it possible for the Thought to control the organic or natural life accordingly as it develops in power by demonstration of Thought over matter, because matter is unable to demonstrate this ability. So, man

"cannot conceive the idea of how things in nature were formed" before Thought developed to a State of Consciousness. But he can conclude now in some degree from experimenting with the different growths in Nature when he has by changing the position and caring for the wild flower he has produced one more beautiful; showing here the development of Thought is greater than Nature alone can produce. This also brings to bear that if God created the wild flower, it—God must have existed as a very crude God or wild Thought, and therefore not "Perfect", as some writers contend, or as Mrs. Eddy says, "God made man perfect," since, only could a Perfect flower issue from a Perfect God, or a Perfect man issue from a Perfect God. In his work on "Science, Philosophy and Morals", Mr. Spencer quotes Mr. Martineau on Evolution in the following:

"The first definite objection which Mr. Martineau raises is, that the hypothesis of General Evolution is powerless to account even for the simple orders of facts in the absence of different numerous substances. He argues that, were matter all of one kind, no such phenomena as chemical changes would be possible; and that "in order to start the world on its chemical career, you must enlarge its capital, and present it with an outfit of heterogeneous constituents. Try, therefore, the effect of such a gift, fling into the pre-existing caldron the whole list of recognized elementary substances, and give leave to their affinities to work." The intended implication obviously is, that there must exist the separately-created elements before Evolution can begin.

12 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

"Here, however, Mr. Martineau makes an assumption which a few, if any, chemists will commit themselves, and which many will distinctly deny. There are no 'recognized elementary substances', if the expression means substances known to be elementary. What chemists, for convenience, call elementary substances, are merely substances which they have thus far failed to decompose; but, bearing in mind past experiences, they do not dare to say that they are absolutely undecomposable. Water was taken to be an element for more than two thousand years, and then was proved to be a compound; and, until Davy brought a galvanic current to bear upon them, the alkalies and the earths were supposed to be elements. So, little true is it that 'recognized elementary substances' are supposed to be absolutely elementary, and there has been much speculation among chemists respecting the process of compounding and recombining by which they have been found out of some ultimate substance—some chemists having supposed the atom hydrogen to be the unit of composition, but others having contended that the atomic weights of the so-called elements are not thus interpretable. If I remember rightly, Sir John Herschel was one, among others, who, some five-and-twenty years ago, threw out suggestions respecting a system of compounding that might explain these relations of the atomic weights.

"What was at that time a suspicion has now become practically a certainty. Spectrum analysis yields results wholly irreconcilable with the assumption that the conventionally-named simple substances are really simple. Each yields a spectrum

having lines varying in number from two to eighty or more, every one of which implies the interception of ethereal undulations of a certain order by something oscillating in unison or in harmony with them.

“Were iron absolutely elementary, it is not conceivable that its atom could intercept ethereal undulations of eighty different orders: though it does not follow that its molecule contains as many separate atoms as there are lines in its spectrum, it must clearly be a complex molecule. Still more clearly is this general implication confirmed by facts furnished by nitrogen; the spectrum of which has two quite different sets of lines, and changes from one set to the other as the temperature is varied. The evidence thus gained points to the conclusion that, out of some primordial units, the so-called elements arise by compounding and re-compounding, just as by the compounding and re-compounding of so-called elements there arise oxides, and acids, and salts.

“Mr. Martineau next alleges that a fatal difficulty is put in the way of the General Doctrine of Evolution by the existence of a chasm between the living and the not living. He says: ‘But with all your enlargement of data, turn them as you will, at the end of every passage which they explore, the *door of life* is closed against them still.’ Here again our ignorance is employed to play the part of knowledge, the fact that we do not know distinctly how our alleged transition has taken place is transformed into the fact that no transition has taken place. We have, in a more general shape, the argument which, until lately, was thought conclusive—

the argument that because the genesis of each species of creature had not been explained, therefore each species must have been separately created.

"Merely noting this, however, I go on to remark that Scientific discovery is day by day narrowing the chasm, or, to vary Mr. Martineau's metaphor, "opening the door". Not many years since, it was held as certain that the chemical compounds distinguished as organic could not be formed artificially. Now, more than a thousand organic compounds have been formed artificially. Chemists have studied the art of building them up, from the simple to the more complex, and do not doubt that they will eventually produce the more complex. Moreover, the phenomena attending isomeric change give a clew to those movements which are the only indications we have of life in its lowest forms. In various celloidal substances, including the albuminoid, isomeric changes accompanied by contraction or expansion, and consequent motion; in such primordial types as the Protogenes of Haeckel, which do not differ in appearance from minute portions of albumen, the observed motions are comprehensible as accompanying isomeric changes caused by variations in surrounding physical actions.

"Thus the reply to this objection is, first, that there is going on from both sides a rapid narrowing of the chasm supposed to be impossible, and, second, that, even were the chasm not in course of being filled up, we should no more be justified in therefore assuming a supernatural commencement of life than Kepler was justified in assuming that there were guiding-Spirits to keep the planets in

their orbits, because he could not see how else they were to be kept in their orbits."

I here use the above quotation merely to point out the fact of opinion based upon Religion, and one based upon Science. Men of religious views have invariably been antagonistic to Evolution because they could not associate their religious views with Evolution. But religious views are continually changing, and therefore should prove that the change is due to the Law of Evolution. There will be as great a change in regard to a Spiritual Life, as there have been changes made in regard to organic life. The truth in regard to man as well as other conditions of life have advanced greater in the past few years than it has for many previous years, because of the discovery of America, since, advanced thought, nor any progress cannot be made to advance when it is arrested as it was before America was discovered.

Darwin, in quoting from Galton, says: "There is apparently much truth in the belief that the wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of the people, are the results of natural selection, the more energetic, restless, courageous men from all parts of Europe having emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country, and having there succeeded best."

We can hardly agree with Galton, that progress is due directly to "the more energetic, restless, courageous men" emigrating from Europe, unless we also agree that men were GIVEN A POSITION in which to express themselves MORE FREELY after landing in this country. It mat-

ters not, how "courageous" people are, if they are not allowed freedom of thought and speech, because bondage will necessarily arrest the thinking faculties to some extent. We have no cause to think, nor even a desire, if we are told, or supposed to believe that ONE MAN, or even a few shall do the thinking for us, which was and even now is the popular religious belief. To make my sentiment more clear on this point, we will bring two very important incidents together which will concur with my statement, and that the progress of the country is as much due to the more FEARLESS KIND, as to the "energetic" as referred to by Galton.

"In 1498 Columbus discovered Trinidad, and the mouth of the Orinoco, and landed at Paria, on the coast of South America. After these discoveries, Columbus steered for Hispaniola where he found everything in disorder. The king's ear had been again abused; and an officer named Bovadilla had been appointed to supersede Columbus as governor, and by this person Columbus was sent home in chains. The spirit of adventure, however, which had borne him up amid so many disappointments, was not to be crushed by injustice. It still burned bright and strong as ever within the great old man who, on the 9th of May, 1502, with four vessels and 150 men, set out once more to seek a passage uniting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, which he imagined lay somewhere between Honduras and Paria.

"In 1505 Martin Luther took his degree of Doctor of Philosophy, or master of arts, when he was twenty-one years of age. Previous to this,

however, a profound change of feeling had begun in him. Chancing one day to examine the Vulgate in the University Library, he saw with astonishment that there were more gospels and epistles than in the lectionaries. He was arrested by his newly found treasure. His heart was deeply touched, and he resolved to devote himself to a Spiritual Life."

In taking these two incidents seriously into consideration, it cannot but impress us with the idea that they were to bring about a complete change of venue in the world of thought, not only in the religious feeling, but in other matters as well. No doubt but the thought advanced by Luther, which is now partly in error thru more progressiveness, would have died with its author, had there not been a chance to express—"water"—it more freely than in the country in which he lived. This chance you will note came with the discovery of America, since it was about that time when the people were well under way to America, and the more "restless", and especially the FEARLESS kind could advance their ideas more freely. This also illustrates the fact that we cannot much hinder development in any form. The saying, "I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world", also proves that the final Truth concerning the Christ as the Idea of life to be lived, was inevitable in the time of the Adamic Era, and that it is hardly conceivable at present. It is "secret" simply because it had not developed into a State of Consciousness until that time, though it could have been brought to light by

18 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

any person under another name, as well as that of Jesus.

All Power and Cause have been attributed to God as a Being, thru custom or usage of it being such whether it is a fact or not, while God as Thought is Power. Power and Cause can be and IS attributed to Satan, yet it should not be used as such. It is not my intention to claim any knowledge of Creation, other than pointing out a few things which seem reasonable as a fact, in order to explain my views, and only aiming thereby to give correct and "up-to-date" definitions of words written in the Bible, which different version is but analogous with the present age of all denominators in changing the definition of the same words from the past belief. Also, in giving the definition of Thought, I must disagree with those who claim there is a Mind existing separate from Thought, or that Thought exists in the Mind, while I argue that Thought is synonymous to Mind, or that Thought is Creator and Creation, or that Thought is a Creation—not separate but co-existing. It is easy to understand how one will be ridiculed and criticised for this assertion, but who of them have been able to define and explain Mind, and even Thought, or by what means do they exist, and of what do they consist, any more than by what exists in the Phenomena? We say this man has lost his Mind, and, of course, if he has lost his Mind, he has also lost his Thought as to Reason or is not able to Reason out any problem. This is proof then too, that Mind or Thought also co-exist with matter, and that Thought cannot exist without matter. But matter can exist without Thought or

Mind, which proves that Creation in the form of Matter did or could and can exist without Thought or Mind, which proves that Creation in the form of Matter did or could exist without a God as Creator, and that Creation is formed or was formed by the formation of abstracts into a more concrete form. We now argue that Thought is Creator and more Powerful than the Physical, because it is able thru its substratum, to conceive the weakness of a single strata as a force, and by the manifestation of this has developed into Power and Creator by placing together abstracts in concrete form into greater abstracts into concrete form. Thought is founded then, by what exists in the Phenomena, and becomes a Creation or Thought or Mind when the Phenomena exists as it is Thought, or there can be no existence of Thought but as it is seen in the Phenomena when all Phenomena conforms to the Thought as the Phenomena. We can only form a different opinion in Thought by different things existing in the Phenomena. If my opinion as to what is right has changed, it is because the Phenomena is changed from what appeared to be a fact to what is really a fact by its more exact truth as a more real existence than what it had appeared in its Phenomena. Every action of Thought is but the result of Thought existing by bringing together one or more things as existing in the Phenomena. The reason the Thought as to the change in Religion is so, is because the present Phenomena of our existence is the result of a Thought outgrown by what had appeared in the Phenomena as so. All our little seeming individual thoughts of things as they differ with other individuals are but the result

of opinion brought about by what appears different to one or the other in Phenomena, which difference is due more or less to the changed state being changed by lack of growth as the case may be in the individual being at one time or other associated differently with things in Phenomena. The thought though, that we shall deal with here is the Thought having developed to Good or to be that of Good, because by the development of the Thought of Evil which has grown to be so in Phenomena is because it—Evil—is seen now to be worthless by what exists in the Phenomena as useful. Thought then, must in time be the outgrowth of matter, as when matter which has fulfilled its growth by the development of Thought will be much less in existence, since it will only be an acquisition in the form of Thought to express Thought as it is to-day, much less in power as a Physical body, because of the Mental growing more in Power as a Mental body.

I shall use the word Mind as well as Thought, or in the same meaning, just as I use the word God as that of Thought, since all are synonyms used to express the same meaning thru different avenues on subjects, only that God in the form of Thought deals directly with the character of man, while other thoughts deal with social functions and creations along the line of invention, etc. Now, if Thought is Creator and it is in the sense of Re-Creation, then why is the word Mind used as a distinct existence and supposed Creator? Really, the word Conscience should be used instead of the word Mind when speaking of what is "held in Mind", because, while Thought is a Unity and a

Whole, it exists AS, or in the individual, because the Conscience acts as an individual, and so Thought creates from being a State of Consciousness and not a state of Mind necessarily. Again: Thought is not individual just because it exists in the individual Consciousness, since the terms "Good and Evil" (God and Satan) are ALIKE in all individuals. An Evil is an Evil whether it be in your Conscience or in mine, therefore IT IS NOT INDIVIDUAL, but is a Unity or a Whole expressed by individuals and can be called a "Son" in that Sense.

Before mental faculties were developed, there was no such thing as God and Satan. The term God has been applied to Creation when that of Abiogenesis and the Biogenesis of life should be used. It has been only since Thought developed, that such a thing as "Good"—God could exist, or such a thing as a Knowledge of "Good and Evil"—God and Satan—could exist. It is because these now exist, that things in nature exist as something. We read of this state of consciousness in Genesis 2:19, saying, "And brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." Things could amount to nothing before this, since man was unable to express what they were. It is not that something exists BACK OF, or besides that which exists as visible. Such reasoning as the former has formed the opinion of two worlds—a Spiritual and a Natural, or that one condition which is SUPPOSED to have existed, and still exists UNKNOWN or BACK OF THIS, will, when the visible or what is termed this Natu-

ral existence shall have finished its course, be known then, and EXIST ALONE as the Spiritual. Such hypothesis of two worlds existing are ridiculous, when taking the objective-matter as a necessary acquisition to hold up the objective-spirit, if the Spirit is at present wholly Absolute. (i.e.) If what is termed the Spiritual, did, or could exist before what is termed the Visible or this Natural, and does NOW EXIST, and THEN CAN EXIST ALONE after what is generally termed the destruction of this world; IT SEEMS UNREASONABLE THAT THIS WORLD SHOULD EXIST AT ALL. If God were Cause of Creation, then God in the same sense must have had a Cause, since God could not exist without a Cause. But NOTHING IS PREDESTINED, because things only develop. God was not the "First" and therefore a Cause, because there could be no such thing as Cause, or a knowledge of Cause until Thought developed, which did not exist until after formation, or the development of the Natural man. Cause is a term that is or should be used only in designating a thing designed. In other words, a Cause is a thing designed, and then the Effect is the result of that thing designed in Thought. So then there could have been no "First Cause" for material in the form of Creation, since Creation would have had a Cause to Create it, when it simply developed thru atoms in contact, because it could not be the Effect without a Cause and could have no Cause because it could not spring from "NOTHING", as referred to in the first part of Genesis. We hear people say, "What was the world created for," or, "What did God have in mind when he created the

world?" It could not be otherwise than what it is, nor otherwise than what it has been. All of this "noise" is the result of selfishness derived from the individual view of life, and therefore not scientific. Jesus was scientific or non-selfish at times, and ignorant or selfish at times, and so we read the TWO WORLD view from his selfish view and not from a Scientific point of view. When he had natural desires, he could hold selfish views, just the same as all nature is shown in all of us more or less—less selfishness in him because he lived away from the world, and therefore held more the Higher Thought.

It is highly conceivable then that God did not exist first, neither did Satan. (Man did not exist first, and man being even as it says, "the image of God", so neither could exist first). So, God and Satan being Thought, so the NAME MAN is this Thought by MAN-ifestation since the time of the Adam and Eve Era, because of "the beginning"—"Genesis" of a Knowledge of two lives—one Higher and the other Lower—"Good and Evil"—than was known by the animal and primitive man. What may be termed solids, or material and therefore being a form of substance, was all and is all that could and can fill space in the form of life. (Principles need no space—God and Satan are these.) So what may be termed the Abiogenesis of life received its initial step from the mass or matter, but when that step was taken and finished, then that was the end of Abiogeny as to one kind of existence, because that which is termed the Biogenesis of life was here developed. It is not because that which WAS, or because it was so, that

such should continue, since that which IS has taken the place of that which was—development in another form, or the form of organic life in another form.

“Heat is a form of Motion”. We know Heat causes matter-material to expand, which is more than likely that Heat could account for, and has had, and does have much to do with giving life, which here may be termed the Abiogenesis of life, for, if particles or atoms of matter were thrown out by “Heat” by way of expansion, and therefore cause in matter what may be termed life because of “Motion”, and thereby come in contact with other particles or atoms of matter thrown out by “Heat” by way of expansion; is it not possible that such could produce Action and Life? If according to Darwin, and I must agree with him that man evolved from a monkey, it stands to Reason that the monkey evolved from a lesser animal, and so on down to the first stage of animal life, and even to nothingness. We can get this illustration from the evolution of Light. Commencing with the candle as a light, next we receive light from kerosene, then the gas and then the electric, which all contain one or more of the same elements in producing light, yet, a much different *form* of light. In the introduction or beginning of the Biogenesis of life which I term formation, which is above or advanced above the Abiogenesis of life which I term NO FORM OF LIFE, yet life because of “Motion”, we could say that a bug was almost the first or the beginning of the introduction of life. (I cannot stretch my imagination farther back than this.) It represents a body

and legs, and it could have shed a particle of life in a different locality than where it had received life, and by coming in contact with different atoms of earth—a different form of life—perhaps a different kind of insect too could be formed—and the continuation of such a process could in thousands of years bring about a higher state of life. (It is said, “birds of a beautiful plumage have been placed in a different or wild country than where they were born, and there changed to a different plumage”). This again proves that environments and the different localities and the substance along with forces in those localities have much to do with the different forming of life, and the life of one, and not that a Being termed God is the Cause of such an existence.

In the following quotation where in his “Recent Discussions in The Sociological Disagreement, or Reasons for dissenting from Comte”, Mr. Spencer gives in his “Science, Philosophy and Morals”, the very like view I take in regard to organic life and its functional associations, saying: “And now let me point out that which really HAS exercised a profound influence over my course of thought. The truth which Harvey’s embryological inquiries first dimly indicated, which was afterward more clearly perceived by Wolf, and which was put into definite shape by Von-Baer—the truth that all organic development is a change from a state of homogeneity to a state of heterogeneity—this it is from which very many of the conclusions which I now hold, have indirectly resulted. In SOCIAL Statics, there is everywhere manifested a dominant belief in the evolution of man and of Society.

There is also manifested the belief that this evolution is in both cases determined by the incidence of conditions—the actions of circumstances. And there is further, in the sections referred to, a recognition of the fact that organic and social evolutions, conform to the same law. Falling amid beliefs in evolutions of various orders, everywhere determined by natural causes, (beliefs again displayed in the THEORY OF POPULATION and in the Principles of Psychology), the formula of Von-Baer acted as an organizing principle. The extension of it to other kinds of phenomena than those of individual and social organization, is traceable thru successive stages.”

How many thousands and thousands of years it required to develop man from the first moving atoms or particles of living matter will never be known, nor is it necessary. Thought could here begin to develop with what may be termed expansion of matter, since such expansion requires expression of Action or “Motion”. Again: Thought may have developed with what we term TOUCH, which would naturally bring about some feeling of expression, for touch is recognized thru cohesion, as a match produces light when it strikes its opposite with force. All the while Thought developed more and more until creatures became upright—man the most of any, and so the Thought developed into a State of Consciousness, and gave man the name “image”, because he appeared to this Conscience to be the creation of some Being. Such a Conscience in those days could easily hold the idea of some Being, or what is termed God and Satan, but as the Thought developed, so did the

Conscience conceive the idea of how things could be created out of the material existing. It was then, too, according to the "Genesis" mentioned in the Bible, that the conscience became Conscious of two conditions of life as to the moral character of men, for, this is the Real God and Satan and Thought in a different form of life and mentioned here as "Good and Evil".

The Adam and Eve Era is the "Genesis", or, "the beginning" of "the world" of Consciousness as to the Sense—Scul of Good and Evil, and so does not refer to Creation. You claim that "God is Good" (this is correct when you conform it to the idea of Good). Should by that very assertion be reasonable enough to acknowledge it does not conform to matter because it is not material, and therefore could not CAUSE creation in the form of matter, and, since, creating such pests as insects and the like would not be in harmony with what we now should term God, or in fact any animal life which we know even as man is brutal, would be contrary to that which is Good, and therefore contrary to God. It is often remarked, "God created these pests, etc., to punish man", when "God is Love", (Thought is Love, or Love is Thought), which cannot issue anything contrary to Love or Truth from its own, since, "Ye cannot gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles". Did you ever stand by and watch the innocent horse being tortured by the insect? Must the horse suffer because the man did a wrong? I use this latter phrase because you sometimes hear that God created the insect to torture man because he—man did wrong. But you should be familiar with the fact

that the insect, like every other specie, is but fighting their own battles for an existence—this is natural and sometimes brutal, even as it is with man to man, let alone the beast that knows no law of social function. It is true that some people suffer because of other's wrongs, and so you connect the horse theory with the same idea. Because Jesus said "it rains on the just, and on the unjust", such a remark has impressed some that "because God caused it to rain on the unjust, it must also rain on the just". This remark only illustrates Results from Natural Causes, and the fact that man is subject somewhat to that which he is naturally related to, and how impossible it is to avoid existing conditions. These things occurring have been attributed to "the fall of man" for so long a time, that we should arise up against such assertions.

The fall of man is a myth, for man has risen ever since he became Conscious of two existing conditions of Thought. If he had not become Conscious of these, there would never have been occasion for such a remark, and "the fall" only illustrates the difference between these two conditions—the Higher and Lower. It would also be and is absurd for man to destroy the things in Creation, if God created them, yet, man is inventing all sorts of things by which he can kill and destroy not only all animal life, but man also. Of course, you get this idea because the writer had the opinion when he wrote "God gave man dominion over all the creatures of the earth", and so with this excuse you kill, and of course, can lay the blame on a different Being. So, to connect God or ANY ONE THING as the cause, is to make ONE THING

the Cause of ALL THINGS, when particles are they which cause each form of life, or THE WHOLE TO EXIST. So, each thing is made individual by individual usage, and may be termed Spirit or Thought, (God is also a Spirit, because Thought is a Spirit), in its relation to the Creation concerning man to rise above the organic or Natural life of man. While he is a unity with the Spirit, he is individual by expression, but, because he is an individual expression, he is only so by form and therefore not responsible for this expression. The Electric spark is the Visible and Invisible Expressing of Electricity; A Good deed is the Visible and the Individual Expression of God, or Thought, and an Evil deed is the Visible and Individual Expression of Satan or Thought.

It is claimed that there are two Minds—one Good and the other Evil. Again, I deal with the Conscience, and not the Mind, nor can I agree that there are two of these. There can be but one Conscience, or even one Mind, but the term TWO is used and understood to be so because things are expressed in two forms of life—Good and Evil. The same Machine will produce a good and an inferior article, therefore not the fault of the Machine (Conscience) but the materials used. The same Conscience produced "THE WATER AND THE WINE", but it was the CHANGED STATE of the same CONSCIENCE due to the Thought which produced the two conditions in the Conscience, and also of those present, and not because of two Minds—so called—or a Good and Evil Mind. This remark also illustrates the Thoughts working, as "Water" signifies Good, and "Wine"

signifies Evil. No two thoughts—Good and Evil—can occupy the Conscience at the same time.

Power I claim could not be attributed to anything until Thought developed, because Power is given by Thought, since such is needed to give Power to a thing, and by Thought of a thing, does a thing receive the Power given it. That Thought is Power, and Power is also Thought, is Expressed in every Action or Moving Machine, for, "Thoughts are things". The hammer is raised thru the knowledge of how the machine should be constructed to raise and let fall the hammer—the hammer being but the Expression of the Thought which causes the Motion or Action of the hammer. But, God is the Thought of Truth concerning a Higher—Heaven—and Spiritual Life, therefore the Eternal (only Truth is Eternal) or Real Power over and above the Satan or Lower—Earth—and Natural life, as the remark by Paul illustrates, "First that which is Natural, and afterward that which is Spiritual". Let me quote here some similar idea of Spencer.

"As the progress of Thought is one, so is the end one. There are not three possible terminal conceptions,—but only a single terminal conception. When the theological idea of the providential action of one being, is developed to its ultimate forms, by the absorption of all independent secondary agencies, it becomes the conception of a being immanent in all phenomena; and the reduction of it to this state, implies the fading away, in thought of all those anthropomorphic attributes by which the aboriginal idea was distinguished. The alleged last term of the metaphysical system—the concep-

tion of a single great general entity, NATURE, as the source of all phenomena—is a conception identical with the previous one: the consciousness of a single source which is coming to be regarded as universal, ceases to be regarded conceivable: differs in nothing but name from the consciousness of one being, manifested in all phenomena. And similarity, that which is described as the ideal Science—the power to represent all observable phenomena as particular cases of a single general fact, implies the postulating of some ultimate existence of which this single fact is alleged, and the postulating of this ultimate existence, involves a state of consciousness indistinguishable from the other two.”

Man is then—not looking at him from a Natural-material point of view—but the Expression of the Good and Evil Thought, and not Perfect, (Mrs. Eddy says “God made man Perfect”), because the Perfect Thought as, final, is not Perfect and Wholly conceivable in the consciousness and therefore not visibly so, because the Imperfect exists as consciousness and visibly so, but ultimately there shall be the man as One Thought or God. It is because we have held in Consciousness the idea of two ends—Heaven and Hell—that the one cannot reach its finality, but we are to-day looking to the one end, which, when conceived as the final end, that end shall be reached. So we—man as he is to-day, cannot live after death, because we cannot Express either Thought—Good and Evil—after death, for, Thought or Spirit is Life in the visible form of life concerning man. Neither can the Machine which expresses action—Life, do so after it

is out of repair or destroyed, but the Idea of the Machine is expressed by another Machine of the same making—form—and perhaps an improvement, just as man is improved in character by the Higher Evolution of Thought.

The word "we" is often used when the word "man" should be used in speaking of the Universal Truth concerning the life of men, because any looking to ourselves as a final end or future is a selfish view. Mrs. Eddy says "the time is coming when WE shall not live to eat, nor eat to live." I agree the time is coming when Man shall not live to eat, but, man in the form of WE shall eat and die so long as the Natural conditions exist, since, we are only forms of life concerning now two conditions—Physical and Mental—Natural and Spiritual—or working according to the development of Thought, since "Ye are as sheep for the slaughter". Men shall require less food gradually as the Higher Thought develops, because the less sexual indulgence, the less food required, since such requires more food to sustain it than any other form of nature. It is this indulgence which places the body in a position to become diseased, and not that "Sanitary Law" shall lessen disease; another "reform movement" that treats the result instead of the fact that persons should be educated as Jesus and Paul aimed in their whole life work to "overcome the world". To any one who has given special attention to persons employed in any factory, or at whatever position in life, he will observe it is not necessarily the filthy environments which cause diseased conditions, but that back of all their "care-worn look" you can trace the same as a re-

sult of evil-mindedness. In the enforcement of our Sanitary Law we forget, like the Pharisee, that the first necessary step to "house cleaning" should be the Conscious, to rid itself of the immoral Thought—Satan—else "ye make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. "Thou blind Pharisee cleanse that first which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." This here again illustrates Cause and Effect being synonymous, or that there can be no "Unknown Cause", but that the Cause is known by the Effect and therefore Knowable. This unhealthy and diseased condition is more noticeable among the poorer class of workers, or those who receive little for their work, and not because of their environments, because they are naturally poorly fed, and since food is a necessary acquisition to the building up of that waste made void thru indulgence, so they are naturally less able to stand excessive indulgence. If "one drop of semen is equal to twenty drops of blood", it is proof that the organ creating this fluid must demand more than its usual share of food consumed in order to meet the demand imposed upon it, and so the organ creating blood is not able to fill its functional position. Organs are like individuals, each working to their own end, and the organ having the greatest demand must and will make a like demand over its fellow organs, since in such like manner it is made superior.

"Man shall not live by bread alone", illustrates the growth of the Higher Thought—God—during the Natural existence, until finally—the end—the

Natural condition shall be "overcome", as in the words of Emerson, "here or nowhere is the fact, for God is omnipresent and omnipotent"; yet only in proportion that it is so, since Satan exists so in part. But "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living". (i.e.) Thought is not the work of the dead, because the Thought cannot work in a dead form.

When you say as Mrs. Eddy says "we", you look to the individual or self form of one working "hereafter". Mrs. Eddy and the general religious belief is that "we" live "forever", but this is a case where "belief" does not make it a fact. While "I and my Father are one", this does not refer to me as an individual, but that I am God as long as I express life as God, which cannot be expressed by me after what is termed death, but that life continues to exist as life in other individuals as God. You have the Thought or Spirit to do Good or to be God, and you have the Thought or Spirit to do Evil or to be Satan, and therefore are you both God and Satan—"Good and Evil", or "One of us". The past and present religious belief of a God to pray to, or that man is not a God, is why we fail in having power over things of the world, just as the boy who always looks up to a father for help is unable to master things. But when we realize the fact that he is of the same material, he will not look up to a father, but look within himself to find the same talent and power. I shall be "stoned" for claiming I am God, and that you are a God, just as Jesus was stoned when he aimed to illustrate the same idea as in the following will show. "Then the Jews took up stones

again to stone him. Jesus answered them, 'Many good works have I shewed you from my Father, for which of those works do ye stone me?' The Jews answered him, saying, 'For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.' Jesus answered them, 'Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?' " Here again in pointing out that God is Thought and Thought is Man, or that Man is God and Man is Thought is because the terms are applicable in the sense that if I act according to what I think, it is because I act according to Thought and I am Thought because of this. If in the opposition I act accordingly, then I am Satan. The animal cannot be a God, nor a creation of God because it knows nothing of and cannot think morally and immorally, but acts according to a feeling derived thru the brain and nerves, and not from what is Thought. It is because a lower intelligence develops by comparison to a higher intelligence that things are conceived as such. To say that "God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever", is in error from the very fact that even religious views of a God have gradually changed.

"Vox populi, vox Dei" can be termed proper, and also that the voice of the people is the voice of Satan.

We have thru custom applied the words God and Satan to different things and causes, when it concerns ONLY US as to two states of life. We say "God caused the lightning", or, "Caused it to rain", or Caused it to bring about earthquakes, drought, or that or this, when EACH have their own law existing because of certain existing con-

ditions. We are under the same law in a way as are other forms of organic life, but are placed above certain conditions, because Thought conditions things to a different environment. We are effected somewhat by the rain, etc., because of OUR ASSOCIATION with them and because of some like material in our construction, and not because God and Satan have anything to do with it. It is only natural that that part of us which is derived from the same source as other things, shall in like manner be treated as such, or, "return to dust". Both God and Satan can be attributed to what are termed the Spiritual and Natural, because there is no other way by which we can explain two conditions, or Spirit and matter. But, both should in the term of Spirit, refer to the Mental, or work from the Mental, since the Cause of one brings a like Effect, and the Cause of the other brings a like Effect in regard to a better and worse condition of life. Nature and its laws has and can exist without these Causes. The animal life existed long before these existed, and does now exist so, and man being the same as to the Physical, also, exists the same. But the things that should and does concern us most, are the Laws of Good and Evil. They deal directly with man, since they exist as we exist with them, and cannot be Expressed without us—man, though not us or "we" after the destruction of that body, but are Expressed by other living bodies. I wish here and always to IGNORE the word "Invisible", only in explanation, since, such a word has and will leave the impression that there exists two worlds. This is the reason why other writers have failed to see the "Un-

known". They believe in two worlds, or that there is a Visible and an Invisible, or that a Thought may have existed prior to its appearance, because they say it was "First the thought and then the spoken word". This idea, too, has caused the belief that the Thought and Word are separate, and, therefore that God and Man are separate. Man has and does believe in two worlds because he has believed that Spirit referred necessarily to some Invisible thing called God, while Matter applied to or referred to the Visible things called man. They can be used as such terms because there is no other method by which we can explain TWO conditions in ONE life, or, to use the words of Spencer: "We can only speak of matter in terms of Mind, and we can only speak of Mind in terms of Matter." The Thought WAS and IS just as much a word as when Thought or spoken. Nor, can one exist prior to the other. This also proves that all Phenomena is the only existence, or that there can be no existence outside of Phenomena. Just the instant a Word is Thought, just that instant does it become a Word, therefore they are not separate, only by verbal usage, nor are there two existences, and so there cannot be anything "Unknown". Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also." How truly then, can the "Father" be Known. Not that there existed a Being or Personality in the form of man as Jesus appeared. Not that Jesus was separate, or an individual, and therefore a "Son". But that the life he Expressed was in Unity with the "Father"—Thought of a Higher Idea of life than the man can express while living after the Natural life and Adam Idea, therefore,

"the Christ". Jesus was not that Christ, nor "the Son of God". Jesus was no more than You and I, yet, he was called "the Son", and was so, so long as he spoke the Word of God, which was not a Word from God or of a God, but a Thought-God Expressed, therefore, a Son. So then, a Son of Thought is a "Son of God", which cannot be so in Nature, for in Nature, man is a Son of man. So, "He that hath seen me"—the form of Thought Expressed in the World, "hath seen the Father also"—because the Father is this Thought by MAN-ifestation. The Spirit is called Spirit and Invisible because it is not really individual, and exists as Thought from one generation to another. The word Spirit can be applied to Satan as well as to God, for both are Mental, since the Evil is Spirit or Thought when it is acted—Visible. I must, at every instance, remind you that the Evil Thought and the Act are but ONE existence. Therefore, there is no "Unknown Cause", for like produces like, for nothing Unknown can exist outside of what may be unknown as material not discovered or unearthed. But, anything concerning the Metaphysical cannot exist until it is known, and it is because of the Evolution of Thought and the growth thereof, that things are changed. It is easy to understand why Jesus had more of a conception of the Ideal life. Thought growth is by sowing, just as much as nature produces more than its equivalent by sowing. Because he made more of a study along the line of Metaphysics, so was he in a position to receive more of the development of Thought. After he had received the fullness thereof, he began to sow, but because of the brute

or animal nature that so predominated in his time, it was impossible for the Mental faculties to grow or to reap much of a harvest. It still continues, because "The flesh works against the Spirit", or the "Natural man" looks and studies more of nature than he does of Spirit. To-day, we read more along the lines which treat of the Physical than of the Mental. We are continually "treating" the body. And it is no wonder, since we care more to live "after the flesh" than "after the Spirit". When we get the idea out of our Natural Consciousness that "God created man", or that "he was put here for a purpose", etc., then, and not until then will the growth of Thought be more universally lived. "The harvest is ripe, but the laborers are few". "God is a Spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth". So is Satan a Spirit, but man is told not to worship—be conscious of HIM in spirit, for, concerning God it says: "The hour cometh, and NOW IS, when the TRUE worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth". Paul said, "Beloved, believe not EVERY SPIRIT, but try the SPIRITS whether they be of God." In referring to God and Satan, or Truth and Error, Paul said, "We are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of error." You will note here with me that "Spirit" refers to both "Good and Evil", or Truth and Error, while most religious writers claim that Spirit refers to God only. Again, "Now we have received not the spirit of the world"—Evil and Temporal—"but the Spirit which is God"—

Good and Eternal. This places the Idea or Adam with Satan, and the Idea as Christ with God, when concerning the life of man as Thought, but not in Creation. This Thought—God and Satan—has ALL TO DO WITH THE CONDITION OF MAN, but not necessarily with the physical condition of man. The form or shape of man is not to be changed, but the character and condition, and understanding these as Thought, it is easy to understand how man is to be “born again”. To claim God is “First Cause”, is to place the Evil conditions and all deformities in nature as the Effect of that Cause, which to me seems very impossible, since, Truth cannot produce its opposite, or Error. I repeat again, that there was no “First Cause”, since Thought as Cause is DERIVED FROM CONDITIONS THAT EXIST, and can have a cause to change these conditions, which former conditions of matter had no Cause before Thought developed, but existed as material substances. This idea you will note, also, does not place either God and Satan as the Cause of the other. Neither is the Higher Evolution of Man due to going back in search of his origin as atoms of matter and organic life, but to hold in Conscience, or be Conscious of that which pertains to a Spiritual Life only as existing forever.

We are to-day coming more into the knowledge that the Bible is but a history and chronological data of words which presented themselves to the Conscience of man only in keeping with a generation in which they could be applied as such as having their part with the lives of man in those days, therefore, are not the words of God as a

Being. In other words, each generation is lived according to the knowledge of God and Satan, and NOT because "God said" this or that. God said that or this because man thought—the Thought presented itself as to this or that concerning God, since God could only be known as the conception was known to exist. It was not that God said this or that, but that such was the conception of God by the authors of these narratives, when they become Conscious of this or that concerning God. In other words: It was they who spoke and wrote as they believed they had heard and understood—being of a more brute and animal nature, the words and thoughts appeared in the Conscience, but appeared to them as coming from some other source or Being. They were more or less in a state of sleep or trance when they "heard" and wrote things impossible as recorded in some parts of the Old Testament. So, they had more of a Personal God than we of to-day, (to-day however, we see the result of hereditary conditions), because they SEEN God Personal, for they were more Personal—Natural animal—than we of to-day. Of course, there can be no other God than as he is seen, since God to that man is the exact image of what that man believes. We have more Gods to-day, because we have more beliefs, that is, more conceptions of what God is. But they cannot be the final Gods, because there is but One God, and, have they "seen the Father", who claims this or that belief?

The Old Testament contains much of "God said" so and so, while the New Testament contains the words mostly of Jesus Christ. As the

generations pass, there is a marked opinion and diversion noticeable as to what these words in the Testament signify, which interpretation of the same has given rise to many popular religions. Such a diversion and **DRAWING AWAY FROM BELIEFS** is evidence that they are all a matter of opinion, or not a certainty that any of these conclusions are correct. It is only thru experience and observation and time, regardless of any former belief proved to be wrong, that a final conclusion can be reached. "Ye can discern the face of the sky", because you look only on nature, but ye should "discern the signs of the times", because, not only nature should be considered, for, we are learning by "the signs of the times" that nature has played too prominent a part in the life of man. Asylums of all description are being erected for the purpose of those who are so unfortunate as to be the offspring of the lower self. In trying to build up man, we have failed to impart the law of Thought, which has Power to build up or to destroy the Physical conditions. But, we are living more in that generation when Thought is being sown to more advantage than in the past, and even the most "radical" thinkers and even dreamers are being listened to. We have "believed" too long the "old doctrines" because they were said by "well read men" to be facts. Many a lie has been thought and accepted as a truth until it was uncovered. The disciples said many times to Jesus that they "**BELIEVED**", yet we find "he rebuked them for their lack of **UNDERSTANDING**", which is proof that it is not only in the "belief" of a thing,

but the "understanding" of that thing which gives it its rightful position.

So then, it is clear that the doctrine of a certain creed, or ANY CREED not holding the SAME VIEWS TO-DAY AT EVERY POINT as it held in THOSE DAYS, are not reliable and authentic, and therefore subject to ridicule. The different remarks in the four gospels are also evident of how true it is that every person does not entertain the same view of a remark or subject given or lectured upon, else there would not be such a diversification in the sayings of the four apostles. The Old Testament is responsible for the lack of growth along the line of advanced ideas as to Creation, etc. We to-day ought to discard it altogether. The minister quotes more from it to-day than from the New, which is significant that the "natural man" in his way still predominates in the majority, and this is why the Truth along religious lines of the Spirit or Mental is not developed more universally so. I cannot understand why for so long a time ministers have evaded the remark by Paul, who, so many years ago understood the possible hindrance of a Higher Evolution because of studying things outgrown. He said, "But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil, untaken away in the reading of the OLD TESTAMENT, which veil is done away in Christ". "Even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heads. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away". In the New Testament, the "veil is taken away"—A BETTER UNDERSTANDING IS VISIBLE because "the veil" of MISUNDER-

STANDING "is taken away". The "New" is the Christ as the Idea of life, which view has been and is obstructed (veiled) by reading and studying the "Old" or Adam as the Idea of life. The "Old" illustrates the "Natural Man", and the "New" illustrates the Spiritual Man. Paul said "The natural man knoweth not the things that be of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned". (i.e.), The natural man looks at the physical and natural view, and so cannot accept the spiritual or mental view, or it is mentally "discerned" instead of the past and present view of the physical as the life here to be lived, and that the spiritual is to be lived in another locality.

The Old Testament obstructs Progress as to the True Knowledge of what God is, just as the Progress of a child would be hindered in advanced studies if it continued to read and study the primer. I believe many of the verses written in the Old Testament are the result of and definition of dreams, and I am safe in saying some very bad ones. This generation of Scientific research has brought about such a different view of things and as to God and Satan and Heaven and Hell, that it may rightly be termed "MODERN" by those who hold the ancient view, or misunderstanding. To my thinking, the doctrine expounded by Jesus must have been very modern to those persons of his time, judging by the way in which they accepted it. I like the word "modern" because it signifies so much and is characteristic of a liberal-minded or thoughtful person. God and Satan then, are two Thoughts of life working to an end which no

man—"not even the Son"—can fathom, other than that Truth is Imperative when Error lessens its command, for, Satan has not as yet been worthless, (the Lower condition must always be proved so by the Higher), for, as it says "while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them", and such proof can only be made through the law of Evolution as the above quotation illustrates.

In the following I give the definition of derivatives, and that things as Unities and Trinities are relatively Synonymous.

SPIRITUAL LAW	NATURAL LAW	UNIVERSAL LAW.
The Spirit;	The Word;	The Truth.
The Father;	The Son;	The Holy Ghost.
The Invisible;	The Visible;	The Comforter.

The Spiritual simply signifies an Eternal existence, and the Natural a Temporal existence, and a Universal Law because of the co-operation between the Physical and Mental being necessary so long as the Material is necessary in forming the continuity of the Thought of Life. The Spirit is Spiritual; the Word is Natural, and the Truth is Universal because of the Unity. The Father is The Son and The Holy Ghost because a Unity, though in the form of a Trinity because of the same Universal Law. The Invisible is the Visible in the form of "The Comforter" as Universal. In reference to this Unity of Thought I here again quote the words of Jesus. "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world; I and my Father are one." The word "even", as used in the sentence is to place just a little variation be-

tween Jesus and man in general, whereas, it would be as well to read: ye are not of the world, I am not of the world, I (Ye) and my Father are one. In speaking of this Unity of all men as one and Jesus also, he says "ye are not of the world", and "I am not of the world", by adding, "I and my Father are one". It, of course, appears that Jesus referred to himself only, because of the then and now theory based upon a religious belief of Creation by a God who had created man and other living things, and later seemed to feel sorry for what He had done and so "sent His Son" to make a change. But the above quotation magnifies the idea into a more reasonable definition when we associate all as a Unity, in that Jesus here makes no distinction between himself and others as to being differently created. Therefore, he is no more a Son than others, yet, more so, or "even" more so because of his unequaled manifestation of that Unity called Spirit above Matter.

The word "Christ" in the New Testament is synonymous with the word "Image" as used in the Old Testament as far as the Unity of life is concerned, or, Christ refers to the Unity of the Spiritual or Mental life, while Jesus refers to the Natural or Physical life as the "Image" and both are synonymous to the word Idea, because both are an Idea of life. Idea is the definition of Image given by Webster, and taking this definition as true, I will give my definition of the word Idea by way of an illustration.

An Architect planned a building to be erected, therefore an Idea, but not necessarily the building. The building was destroyed by fire, but the Idea

still continued to exist, for, a dwelling was soon replaced after the same Idea; and you will agree with me that if the Idea had been destroyed, the structure could not have been rebuilt the same, and agree also that it could not be rebuilt from the material destroyed by fire. Now, Man—the Spiritual or Mental Idea or Christ, or God, or Thought—will exist forever; but Man—the Physical or Natural “Image” having not lived as the Christ because of the past and present material conditions, can no more exist or return to life after death, or continue to exist in another life or locality, (there is no other life as we shall presently see, if we have not already seen), than the material used in the construction of the building, after it is destroyed by fire; since, Man or You are but presently the embodiment of two Ideas known as Adam and Christ, and therefore subject to two conditions of life—Physical and Spiritual, or Natural and Mental.

Because I have referred to the Architect as having an Idea of creating or planning a building, it might be constructed from such that the meaning would infer that God is a Being (this is even now the general religious belief) or Person with a Mind having an Idea as to man, which is no more than the theory that the architect has no Idea of HIS OWN. The architect is but a form by which the Idea is able to develop, and ideas that develop by one architect differently than another, is not that they are individual ideas, for, the ideas differ only because of different conditions which may environ that architect. The term “mind in man” gives man the Creative idea, therefore AN IDEA that man is the IDEA OF GOD, or SEPARATE from

God; when man is an individual term for God, since this God or Thought could not exist—be known—without the form of man.

In speaking again of God as Cause of this or that, we will refer to Geology which has a Law of its own. Mr. Mallet says, "Volcanoes, and the centers of the earthquake disturbances, are near the sea, or other large supplies of water: and that when an eruption of igneous matter takes place beneath the sea-bottom, the first action must be to open up large fissures in its rocky material, or to lift and remove its incoherent portions, such as sand, gravel, mud, etc. The water on meeting the heated surfaces assumes the spheroided state; while in this condition, the intestine motion may be great, but little steam is generated; but no sooner have the surfaces cooled, than the water comes into closed contact with them, and a vast volume of steam is evolved explosively, and blown off into the deep and cold water of the sea, where it is condensed, and thus a blow of the most tremendous sort is given at the volcanic focus, and being transferred outwardly in all directions, is transmitted as the earthquake shock. On the surfaces again becoming heated by conduction from the molten mass, the various phases are again repeated. This is the CHIEF CAUSE of earthquakes, but they may also be due to the evolution of steam thru fissures, and its irregular and per-saltum condensation under pressure of sea-water; or to great fractures and dislocations in the rocky crust, suddenly produced by pressure acting on it from beneath, or in any other direction."

We can conclude from the above quotation that

the rain, snow, etc., have their Law in nature, as well as the earthquake. Man is subject to two conditions growing, besides the conditions of the Material or organic forms of life because of having a State of Consciousness, while creations have but the one Law of their own in Creation. Man is subject somewhat to the earthquake, etc., and some things are subject to man, because of association, and not because of a God making it so. The bean springs from its own Law and Creation, and is plucked by man and destroyed by man, but not because of its own Law of creating and destroying.

Jesus said in regard to Evolution concerning man on a Metaphysical basis: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but the living." These verses simply allude to generations, which is evolutionary, or, is from Adam until Jesus Christ. This is "the beginning" of Spiritual Law and can be termed God, which begins after the complete end of Natural Law in the way of formation, and both are working to "their end". Jesus could not here allude to any following generations, nor know the actual Truth of such conditions which might develop, since, "no man knoweth, not even the Son", what shall be, yet he could and did prophesy what might be the result of Truth as he saw it, by overcoming "THE WORLD"—SEXUAL INDULGENCE. The Father could know no more than the Son, and so "The Son" could not even know, since both are of the same, or signify a Law working according

to the growth and development of Thought, for, "HE THAT HATH SEEN ME HATH SEEN THE FATHER ALSO", illustrates this "ONE-NESS" or SAMENESS. Thought, being a growth along Mental lines, it could not predestine, and so "the Son"—Individual—expressing this Unity—Thought—could not know the actual end. So, God is the God—Thought and work of Abraham, yet, NOT AFTER DEATH, but the Thought and Work of Isaac, yet, NOT AFTER DEATH, but the Thought and Work of Jacob, yet, NOT AFTER DEATH, but the Thought and Work of "THE SEED" following these generations, since life cannot exist as the Spirit either for Good and Evil where death exists, or in a dead body—"GOD IS NOT THE GOD OF THE DEAD, BUT OF THE LIVING".

So then, there is but one course to pursue, and therefore the duty of every man is to be Conscious of the Higher Thought, in order that the Spirit of perfection will become a visible possibility. Any other view is selfish, that is, if we look to ourself as an individual result, we are holding the wrong Thought which is natural and ends in death because it belongs to nature. Emerson wisely says, "those who live to the future must always appear selfish to those who live to the present." Mrs. Eddy says "Man is Spiritual and not Material." I claim every man is as much Natural (I prefer to use the word "Natural", as Paul does, instead of the word "Material") as he is Spiritual, if he is Conscious of both in the same proportion, and so too because of both conditions existing. This mortal—flesh Idea—can only "put on immortality"

as Immortal Thought is Thought, which is to say that the flesh—natural indulgence—is “OVER-COME” by this Higher Thought. I agree that Man—the Idea or Christ of Life is “Spiritual” or Mental and Eternal, and not “Material”—Physical. Jesus avoided the Thought concerning Nature almost continually, yet, there are evidences that he did not do so incessantly, or live the Idea—Christ of Life entirely, nor could he in that age any more than we of to-day.

I shall refer to the Natural as an Evil because of its being CONTRARY to the Spiritual growth of a Higher Thought—God—of Life, and not that it is necessarily Evil—Sin as the religious belief contends that it is so, and continues in the same because its arguments contradict themselves. The Natural is according to Nature in its relation to the Material or Organic Life existing as a condition, and CERTAINLY NOT OUTGROWN, therefore no SIN, because “THE CHRIST” is not Wholly developed as the ONLY or ONE LIFE. Both “Good and Evil” must “GROW SIDE BY SIDE” until “the harvest”. This is why, in the words of Jesus, “they had not had sin”, and so we have no sin in ourselves—individual responsibility—for, there is no sin for man, only in the form that sin exists in the form of man, and the Natural is contrary to Spiritual growth—“the flesh lusteth against the spirit”. Man—You are not responsible because “the flesh lusteth against the spirit”, but subject to whatever the conditions may be; whether “for Good” or whether “for Evil”. So then, Christ is not an individual or Jesus, since

Christ could not exist in Paul if it were a FORM, for, Paul said "CHRIST LIVETH IN ME."

In Genesis 2:21-22, it reads: "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept, and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." If taken metaphorically, this is as absurd as the remark made to a child when a birth has taken place in a family, "the doctor brought it", and WE LIKE CHILDREN HAVE BELIEVED IT. But, here again, I claim that the book of Genesis illustrates the first state of Consciousness. The above quotation also proves that man was ignorant as to Creation in those days. The word "sleep" signifies this, or that HIS EYES were not opened to the facts of Creation, and also proves that Adam was not AWAKE to the fact that woman, or Eve, was his "HELPMATE", or of an opposite sex, for, before this state of Consciousness had developed, they were as ignorant of male and female sex as the different types of animals, or like them, except in form—having no Thought and Consciousness of Right and Wrong—Moral and Immoral—"Good and Evil"—God and Satan. It is recorded that "the stars and moon danced at the wedding of Adam and Eve", which signifies CONFUSION, or not a state of perfect management of things. The above chapter of Genesis also denies the above statement in regard to making ONE from the OTHER, as referred to in the chapter preceding it. It says in Genesis 1-27, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male

and female created he them." Also, "Heaven and the earth, and all things of the earth, and lastly man and woman, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply." This last remark also contradicts the idea that any one sins, or, that Adam and Eve sinned. These commands, or seeming commands are only to illustrate the development of either Thought—"Good and Evil"—which Thought would control all men according to the kind of Thoughts held Consciously, which came to them as a knowledge of "Good and Evil", or the two then and now existing conditions of life. "The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked", illustrates they had now received a much higher knowledge of life than the animal, or natural way of appearing, therefore a sense of things morally and immorally. The same nude fashion exists to-day under the name of "High Art". It is amusing to read the objections offered, and by those very persons upholding art, of such forms placarded on show bills in even less form of nakedness, yet, the tendency to suggest immorality or the animal and brute nature is more evident in high art than in the other. This nakedness and immoral suggestion can be seen in the "art windows", and like all immorality under a name, as in Religion some things are overlooked and tolerated, so is this nakedness in the name of art respected. One Editor on commenting on this, or, as he writes: "because we come into the world without any clothes on, it is no more than right that we should be more true to nature and overlook the nakedness, and be just as morally inclined, even if we do appear in a nude fashion, or as

nature made us." I cannot understand how we could come into the world WITH ANY CLOTHES ON, nor why, because of this nudeness of nature we should not advance above the BRUTE in the clothes proposition, as well as any other occupation and Science. This should open our eyes to-day, to the fact that all such parts should be covered, because we are living in an age when suggestion has much to do with moulding the life of man, and our "civilized" methods seem to place us in a different attitude toward each other even as nature intended, or as lived by the less civilized and animals. The women seem more prone to this, but we must expect this, since it has been and is the custom for women to entertain and use different methods by which they shall attain their rights. Though the men have no inclination to "make up", it is not that they are more moral than the women, and it is generally the women who wish to attract mankind who dress this way, since, we find many women of a less bolder type—evil less prominent in them—who dress more modestly, and find comfort in it, even in the warmer climates. It is the women who "make up", and if I believed in "unequality", as Mrs. Eddy says, and some others, I should say from experience and observation, that it is the women who "tempt" the men. Hallie Ermine Reves did not realize how true she spoke when she said she "believes that each gown she owns should reflect some particular mood or flash of thought". Each dress is the result of some thought, and the wearer must also reflect some such "flash of thought" during the time of wear. I claim that clothes do have a great part in one's life,

or that clothes do "make the man", that is, you can generally judge about what sort of a man he is by the clothes he wears. Now, just the fact that man navigates erect, or upright more than the beast, is sufficient evidence that those parts should be covered, and the skin being smooth and generally hairless, signifies a necessity for being clothed. There are some men and women living to-day who have more of a heavy clothing of hair on their bodies than others, who, of course, could be responsible for such remarks of a brute nature in opinion, since, it signifies more of an animal nature in them than in others, because it is more a type of the primitive man and brute nature; and I have observed that such are generally more given up to the animal desires, or believe more in nature and live according to it than others, or, are more prone not to believe in a Higher Spiritual life here. So we have persons, according to remarks by some, who would return to DEGENERACY, or the BRUTE, just because IT WAS and IS a natural condition, or because "we come into the world without any clothes on". We can overlook the "babe", for, it too, signifies the animal—ignorance—since it creeps and goes about like the animal, and is not Conscious of either "Good and Evil", or, is significant of the same condition as Adam and Eve before the Thought developed, and different conditions existed.

I remember on my summer travels in Pennsylvania when going thru the poorer districts of the mining towns, especially the more illiterate and foreign settlements, of seeing women almost nude and nursing infants, which reminded me very much

of an old sow and her little pigs. Now, this is according to nature—the brute part of it—and if people call this **A PART OF CIVILIZATION**, then I wish to disown nature and civilization. If men and women would appear at home more like they see each other before marriage, there would be more respect held out for each other, since, environments Cause conditions of Thought, as well as Thought Causes a condition of environment. It is when you appear “untidy”, and in a loose garment and the like, that the respect held out for each other before marriage begins to wane, because you appear more like the animal or brute nature, and the finer sense of taste and morality disappears at such a sight. This position is much like or characteristic of the sporting house. In this condition you are more apt to try and satisfy the sensual appetite, which finally causes the feeling of dissatisfaction, because one or the other cannot hold out to the full desires of the other, or brute nature, and like the brute or animal you wander off to satisfy this appetite in others, which finally ends in divorce and disaster for one or the other or both.

I may be permitted here to offer some personal experience in pointing out the real facts—not to censure women—to prove that Thought exists in an Evil form with women as with men. Several years as a solicitor, collector and other dealings with women has demonstrated to me that the per cent of unfaithful married women is extremely large, and, among what are termed the “higher class” is as great as the “lower class”, **IN THEIR PROPORTION**. But money is a help to make the former better able to cover up their ways than the

other, while "fear" is responsible for THE CUNNING OF BOTH, and the single ones as well, in hiding and deceiving those whom they wish to deceive and the public as well. Of course, "fear" causes them to cultivate the art of deception, which of course, is nothing against them, because they are not allowed thru "custom" derived from the Old Testament study, to be on an equality with men as I believe they should be, or to be respected the same. Many shops and stores and offices could unfold this Evil among girls and their male companions. A few weeks behind the scenes of the best Theaters has convinced me of this traffic among stage girls and men "higher up". It is difficult to engage the better looking and developed chorus girls and some of the better talent to leave New York for the road, because men pay them well to remain in the city. Much is written about "the evil of men", and "the goodness of women", from what they believe is so, whether they have had any experience or not in these things; counting mostly on observation alone. A good woman would naturally write about the goodness of woman. But experience teaches us that in any transaction, it always requires two to make a bargain, and not as one lecturer said, "When you find a fallen woman, you will find a man back of it." Granting that a man was a party to it, we can hardly conceive the idea that the woman had no voice in the matter. A woman who wishes to retain her virginity, will not sell her character to gain a living. I cannot agree with those who demand higher wages for women, that such will make better women. Money does not make one morally better, in fact, it is

generally the cause or ruination of a character, since it places one in an easy environment where the condition of one's life is changed if the Thought works to that end. If we study life as it is, we shall find that the tendency to-day, and according to the Darwin theory is to gain a living thru the easiest way, or avoid as much as possible any hard labor, and the household work generally is looked upon as not the most pleasant and easy way of making a living. You seldom find a hard worker, a bad character; in fact they do this sometimes in order to avoid bad character environments. The Evil is generally more seen in men and by men because it is customary not to be so hidden and disrespected as it is by women. It is more open to-day among women, because woman is more independent of man to-day, and not because it is a "growing evil". When women become more on an equality with men, or have "equal rights" in all things as they shall surely have, then will she be more independent of man and so be more respected by man and like men, and will not care any more what is said of her character than what is said of man's character, and one shall not be respected nor disrespected more than the other. I believe in equality here as well as in many things, and I repeat here that the Evil is just as strongly impressed in the Conscience of woman as in man, but FEAR TO USE IT IN THE PAST has withheld it to some extent. If woman HAS BEEN, or IS BETTER, it is because SHE HAS PROFITED BY THIS FEAR, and NOT BECAUSE SHE IS A WOMAN.

When this Conscious State of Thought—" Good

and Evil"—developed in Adam and Eve, we read the argument which came up between them. I call it an argument because it simply illustrates this in the following, "And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest *to be* with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat." "And the Lord God said unto the woman, What *is* this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me and I did eat." Mrs. Eddy has very wrongly grasped the true meaning of these two verses, because equality should prevail as to anything, and it certainly should begin here, but became unequal because man wrote the contents of the Bible and aimed to please himself more than the woman. She points out that the woman, or Eve, "admits here" that it was "the serpent" who tempted her instead of the man, while the man claims—as she points out—"the woman tempted him"—Mrs. Eddy making it appear that the woman—so she says, "IS MORE JUST THAN THE MAN", because Eve did not say "the man tempted her", just as if in that almost brute generation they could recognize any given qualities or inequality, when such have been and are cultivated thru growth of the same by continued use of the same as so. I could agree with Mrs. Eddy if HER OPINION were possible, or if she could prove it, but as it is BUT AN OPINION, and not a proof that it is true, we will be more considerate, or "JUDGE NOT", and place both man and woman on an equal footing by scientifically explaining IT WAS and IS neither the man as the individual cause and independently working, nor the woman as the individual cause and independently working that did and does do

the tempting. I contend to prove that it is not man and woman working, but the Evil Thought—"Serpent"—which tempts the other. That is, the Evil in one tempts the Evil in the other, then, the Evil or Thought is performed by both, and that we—bodies are subject most to the One we are most Conscious of,—“whether of sin unto death”, or of “obedience unto righteousness”, which is nothing more than the Consciousness of “Good and Evil”, or, its own working. My interpretation, then, of these two quotations is, that the remark made by Adam that “the woman tempted” him, signifies that man and woman embodies “the Serpent”—Evil which tempts, and the remark of Eve that “The Serpent beguiled me”, signifies “the Serpent” which man and woman embodies, or, the former remark illustrates the body in the form of Spirit, and the latter illustrates the Spirit form of the body, and making equality throughout rather than diversity. “Judge not, lest ye be judged”, illustrates it is the Good and Evil working, and that no man and woman should condemn another, or say as Mrs. Eddy refers too, that one is at fault more than the other. We should remember and understand “there is only one Good and that is God”, (i.e.) Good refers to God as Thought, because Good is Thought, and Thought is Good when used in the term applied to it by Jesus. We can use the opposite in the same form, that is, there is only one Evil and that is Satan. Jesus always avoided the individual when speaking scientifically, but used the individual term when rebuking those whom he addressed, since, it could hardly be expressed otherwise. In order to explain away the

idea that God refers to a Being, or a Spiritual Being, or the "Unknown", I will use the word Thought to replace that of God in the common Bible quotations, and also reverse the sentence in order to show the Spirit significance of the word Thought as an Expression by MAN-ifestation. It reads: "God is Love". So, Thought is Love, and Love is Thought. "God is Good". So, Thought is Good, and Good is Thought. "God is a Spirit", so, Thought is a Spirit, and Spirit is Thought because neither are material, and, in fact, all terms applied to the Unity of anything Mental is Metaphysical and not Physical. In whatever sentence the word God is used, it can be replaced by Thought to a more reasonable definition than it can be to that of a Being, since Love, Good and Spirit are not significant of a Being, but are the Action—Life of a Being or Person.

To preach and hold to the Thought of both Good and Evil, and Heaven and Hell, as in general Theology is why we cannot destroy the Evil and Hell—both being ideas—since, the Evil and Hell will continue SO LONG AS THEY ARE RECOGNIZED. Recognition of anything is only the life of that thing. This is why in my estimation reformers generally are a detriment to the country. The only use or benefit they are, are the positions they fill, or offices created. Watch as you may in any reform movement, and you will note in the case of liquor they aim to destroy the RESULT instead of cause and effect; the saloon being the result of the cause which cause is effect by appetite. The "vice commission" aims to destroy or to put the "red light district" out of business, which

is the RESULT of cause and effect or that like produces like, and so it is in all acts of reformation. They are only the effect of an appetite known as cause, and appetite for anything can only be destroyed thru education, or to educate one to use his or her talents to better advantage than to form habits of intemperance. It is only in this way that man is made master over anything. To remove a thing or any obstruction by force, other than by a method gained through study and talent, is to weaken that talent so man becomes unfit to cope with any obstacle in his way. Man only becomes man above brute when he can say "I am master of the appetite." To remove the saloon, or anything created by education and formed as a habit must be destroyed by an opposite education. So then, the only way to destroy a thing is not to further its recognition, since, so long as Evil things are Thought, and talked of, they must exist so. If liquor and the like were less talked of, they would in that proportion exist less, because we would gradually forget them, since, the Conscience of such, would be replaced with other thoughts. That the sexual indulgence is the only real Evil which retards spiritual growth is here significant by the word "Serpent", because it is the LOWEST or MOST LOATHSOME TYPE of animality. So, if the Serpent or Evil in and by man in form, tempts the Evil or Serpent by woman in form, then, the Evil is accomplished in both, and it is the same Evil and HAS NO CHOICE as to whether it be a man or a woman, for, "God is no respecter of persons"—Thought is no respecter of persons, nor can it be, since it develops, for, Good

and Evil prevails accordingly where the environments are Good and Evil and as to how much—both man and woman being subject accordingly to such environments, and changed only when one or the other predominates thru education. In the same chapter, and which I have made mention of heretofore, it says: "And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become one of us, to know Good and Evil." Here we find that man, though he was man in animal form heretofore, he now became ONE OF US—to know Good and Evil, therefore either one or "US" at times because he is the reflector of Good and Evil at different times. This also contradicts the idea that a certain man at one time, or that man as he lives to-day is condemned or not, hereafter, for doing that which he is unable to avoid under the then and even now existing conditions, for, he is the result—"Natural selection"—of BOTH "Good and Evil", since KNOWING THEM, he is either condemned or not to that extent he is Conscious of them NOW. So, as the generations pass, we find as a Higher Thought of Life develops in the Conscience of man, that he likewise evolves into greater possibilities, because, only thru Thought and the Right Thought are things made Rightly. It is by the consciousness of a Higher—Spiritual Thought, that man reaches a Higher-Heaven state of Life, and NECESSARILY LESSENS the Lower—Natural Thought and Lower Hell State of Life. Meredith wrote: "What is love but passion, and what is passion but PIN-ING, but where is the man that can live without dining." This "love referred to by Meredith is not the love referred to in the Bible quotations, for

one is to satisfy SELF, while the other refers to the ACT OF DOING GOOD.

Jesus said concerning the development of the Spirit of God, and not of himself, the physical—because he speaks in a self way—"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin". This ADMITS OF NO SIN FOR MAN AS ONE INDIVIDUAL (Adam and Eve did not sin) but admits IGNORANCE of a Higher life than what had been lived by the people. So there really is no Sin, yet, ignorance is a sin in a sense, because ignorance of a law excuses no man generally. He is ignorant of a certain made law, and because of his ignorance he suffers, but when he is able TO THINK as Jesus taught and Thought and so demonstrated, he cannot sin and be ignorant and so works accordingly, since he can only work according to what he is Conscious of, for, no man can continually work against Conscience, so we conclude that it requires Time and Eternity to acquire Perfection in anything, and because of a few "drunks" and the like not being as WE THINK, we should not condemn, since we cannot do the thinking for any man, but are governed by our own. When the disciples said, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" Jesus replied, "NEITHER hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." This illustrates the fact that man himself is nothing but in name, or that he is not guilty necessarily of sinning, but that the Good and Evil are working, and thru the destructive principles of Evil termed sin is Good or God known as it is illustrated so by the above verse, in

that the blind could not manifest the Truth, since, if, "the blind lead the blind, both shall fall in the ditch". Look at the INNOCENT CHILD who suffers, showing NO FAULT of the child, nor the CURSED OPINION that God caused it to suffer for what its parents did, though it was thru what the parents did thru Evil which caused the child to suffer, and shows THE WORK OF EVIL. I prefer to say man WAS and IS born in ignorance, rather than "IN SIN". (Evil ignorant of any other life than its own.) The definition of sin is to do "a thing knowingly", but I claim we do things unknowingly—ignorantly. Some people claim to "know God", (a mistake because merely a belief), and because of this they sin, or term it a sin, yet, showing they are in ignorance and therefore sin, just because they say, they know God, otherwise, it would be no sin, yet, really is a sin in ignorance, because it is a detriment to spiritual growth.

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not my words," and why not? because "my words they are spirit and they are life". In other words, our idea of "Heaven and earth shall pass away", for, there would be no sense to the argument if the earth and even heaven would pass away, since there is no space in which it could fill, because all space is and has forever been filled, therefore it had no "beginning". But the Truth—Words shall live "forever", showing again that heaven does not exist as another locality, and there would not be much pleasure in going to heaven if it shall "pass away". It will be objected to because I claim God and Satan work side by side,

which is the same idea as referred to in the Bible where it says "let them grow side by side". It reads Elsewhere: "With flesh I serve the law of Sin", or, "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die", which, of course, is true also, but IMPOSSIBLE to do otherwise so long as such a condition exists in abetting the Spiritual Idea as it says, "If ye root up the evil ye will root up the good also". I agree that "God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever", that is the Principle of Working is the same in Thought and meaning just as the Principle of a Perfect Light is always the same, but, like the Perfect Light it requires Time in which to develop into the more Perfect way of Light and Life. So I say again, that man could not evolve into a more Perfect State above the brute or animal until Thought or God developed into a State of Consciousness, since there could have been no Soul-Sense of anything Higher until such a State could be reached, for, as in animal, it was like in man—Chaos and darkness. From the very fact that man "must be born again", it is reasonable to hold the opinion there must be a FIRST BIRTH, which is due to the Natural law of Evolution, which is "THE BEGINNING" of the SECOND BIRTH, or "born again" is due to the Spiritual Law of Evolution thru Thought or God, which is the Heaven—Highest conception of life. It is about time to abolish the threadbare statement, "We are all conceived and born in Sin", because such an excuse cannot remedy the evil, but rather is a covering of, or evades the truth, since to say we are born in sin allows the privilege to sin. Jesus illustrated this fact when he said, "If I had not come

and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." This also admits of no sin up to the time of the revelation of how things are to be overcome.

The only remedy there is to know that while the natural man is born under the natural law of evolution, he is to be recreated under the adoption of the spiritual law of evolution, and so cannot be called a sinner, only in the sense that the natural is detrimental to spiritual growth, for in no other way can he escape, and then only in part the law of existing conditions. There are two distinct laws: one is "of the flesh" and the other is "of the spirit". Therefore God is not the creator of the natural man, but of the spiritual man. In other words, the natural law of creation reached its height when the highest form of creation, or man, developed, and then began the spiritual law of creation as defined in the words of Paul, "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual." Therefore "the beginning" of the Spiritual law and "life" of man is illustrated in Genesis as that of "Good" and its attributes. The Old Testament illustrates the ignorance of life, and Nicodemus could not understand how man "must be born again" because he looked to a natural impossibility instead of a mental possibility as Paul says, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds."

Emerson wisely wrote, "If John was perfect, why are you and I alive?" It seems impossible to distinguish or to define a thing unless there be a form of opposition, so the terms God and Satan

are used, and so you or man in the form of animal existence is referred to in Revelation as the "third part". In defining God and Satan as Thought, it will readily be seen that man is God and Satan in proportion that he is Conscious of either, or that they are relative terms to be applied as co-existing. Therefore, not an "Unknown Cause", because seen as an Effect which is known as a Cause. We can be more or less Conscious of either according to environment which same is more or less growth accordingly. Not that man in general, or that the individual—you—is at present to be made in glory, only that we are glorified in health according to our consciousness of the Whole of life, and that "the promise" referred to by Paul is made a period, or "when ALL mortality shall have put on immortality". Mortality lessens in itself to be used as an acquisition in life as material, just as to-day we have less use for material as is illustrated in wireless telegraphy. It says: "they without us could not be made perfect." "They", refers to a coming or future generation, for, as God is not Wholly Perfect in the Visible, as by reason Satan exists as Imperfection—partly in the Visible, so man is not and cannot be Perfect, though Mrs. Eddy claims "God made man perfect". If YOU were to become perfect LATER, there would be no reason to the above passage, which I claim refers to a later period, since "they" are of the future, while you are of to-day. The first settler in a foreign land clears the same of its forests, that a city may be planted, and a more advanced state of civilization reached, which benefits him to SOME degree, or "part", yet, it will bene-

fit those more who follow—and so it is with man to be Conscious of a Thought or God as it develops more, and though it may seem HARD, or “A CROSS”, we, as bodies must “BEAR IT” as Jesus did more than any man of his time because he had a knowledge of it, and therefore could be the only man to bear it, and even under ridicule as all FIRST Knowledge is ridiculed. Man as Satan, makes it “A CROSS” for the Man as God.

“Nay but, O man, who art
Thou that repliest against God?
Shall the thing formed say
To him that formed it, Why
Hast thou made me thus?”

It might be well to mention here that the above remark made by Paul is confined to Thought, rather than Creation, though it APPEARS to refer to creating the material man because it says: “formed it”. Man is no exception to the animal in Creation, but, because of a Conscience, he expresses himself sometimes in complaint of nature, and not necessarily because of complaint against God. The above verse illustrates the natural tendency to complain, and the absurdity of such complaint, when we are existing only thru a law that governs nature. Man is called “the image” because Thought gave it as the highest form of Creation. If the Thought had developed to its FULL HEIGHT at the time when the monkey evolved, then, the monkey would have been “the image”, or, the highest form of creation, and the man would never have existed, since, the Thought of such would

have made it such, because the Thought would have developed a State of Consciousness in the monkey and ended there. While each formation or Creation of living and moving things are PERFECT IN FORM as to THEIR KIND, it did not show the greater development of Thought until man was evolved. This you will note places God or Thought as not Wholly or Perfect, because a Lower or Evil Thought could here be derived from the animal nature. You will find only in one instance where Jesus speaks about God as a Creator, and then it has all to do with Thought and not the things created. This is in Mark 13:19. "For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the Creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be". Creation signifies THE END of that which is created, when referring to things created, while "creation which God created unto this time", is the Evolution of Thought working "UNTO THIS TIME", since all things were created long before the time in which Jesus lived, and so could not refer to material things "UNTO THIS TIME"—his time, and so the Thought working FROM GENERATION TO GENERATION, or from "THE BEGINNING" of the end of Creation. "Affliction" here, is the transformation the Evil is going thru by its abolition being made by the Higher Sense of life. In other words, as it says in Revelations: "The devil knoweth that he hath but a short time to live". In John it speaks of "all things were made by him", but this was the opinion and the WORDS of John, and were so to John because he believed it so, just as Paul and others have believed and said "God

created all things". Jesus did not say "God created all things", but "there is only one Good and that is God". I rather believe Creation is a law existing thru certain things coming in contact with each other as is illustrated by the earthquake—the earthquake being FORMED by certain natural causes, and God or Thought is a Cause working thru these organs. In "Principle of Psychology" Herbert Spencer says as much regarding life in matter.

"Moreover, there is no reason to suspect that the so-called simple substances are themselves compound, and that there is but one ultimate form of Matter, out of which the successively more complex forms of Matter are built up. By the different grouping of units, and by the combination of the unlike groups each with its own kind and each with other kinds, it is supposed that there have been produced the kinds of matter we call elementary; just as, by further compositions similarly carried on, these produce further varieties and complexities. And this supposition—the phenomena of allotropism go far to justify, by showing us that the same mass of molecules assume quite different properties when the mode of aggregation is changed."

All forms and the primitive state of man are alike, or they did and could exist without what I term God and Satan, since Thoughts are a separate existence when concerning Good and Evil as things. Because certain laws exist, and man frames the laws accordingly, you will say, "how can what you claim is the law be made unless God created things in nature". I say man makes laws because of cer-

tain existing conditions that are derived from the conditions that exist, and not that man—the individual living, necessarily makes them. He speaks of them as made, because they are expressed in this way, but, they would naturally be so and so, yet, they are again changed and seem to be changed by him when that condition cannot exist because of other conditions which come up more reasonable as a natural sequence or following, which is due to Evolution, and not due to the individual direct. To ask “what causes Evolution” is to be ignorant of the fact that no law can exist which conforms to degeneracy, or is opposed to growth. You say God Caused it to rain, but Science teaches us that this is not true.

“Whatever lowers the temperature of the air at any place below the dew point, is the CAUSE of rain. Ascending currents are caused by the heating of the earth’s surface, for then the super-incumbent air is also heated and consequently ascends by *its levity*. Air-currents are forced up into the higher parts of the atmosphere by colder, drier and therefore heavier wind-currents getting beneath them, and thus wedgeways thrusting them upwards; and the *same result* is accomplished by ranges of mountains opposing their masses to the onward horizontal course of the winds, so that the air, being forced up their slopes, is cooled, and its vapor liberated in showers of *rain* or *snow*. Again, the temperature of the air is lowered, and the *amount* of the *rainfall* is increased, by those winds which convey the air to higher latitudes.”

I have given the italics to the words in the quotation in order to impress the reader with the facts

as to what is the CAUSE AND EFFECT, and WHY the "amount of the rainfall is increased", showing that God is not the Cause, and does not INCREASE nor DECREASE the rain when that class of people appeal to an "Unknown God" by prayer to make a change. It is the same "Unknown God" whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him I declare unto you" (Acts 17:23). We have the Cause of rain, and so can and should find by study and experiment the causes which cause the one cause—"the temperature of the air"—the wind, or that and this, and by so doing we find ourselves BACK TO THE RAIN, or where we left off, since all seems to work on the principle of a cycle. So it is with everything that grows, two or more parts or particles cause the one, or expression of what may be termed one kind or form of life, and consequently are all correlated and associated organically with each other and called "Creation" and has no "first cause", but is a result of Evolution. This is the Law and Order of things in Creation, and the raindrop, the snowflake, etc., are as beautifully formed as man and other things. It is impossible for the Mind to conceive the fundamental idea of how things are formed in the Natural form of Creation, because the Thought cannot conceive anything which it has no real part in as a Creator. All parts go to make up the one part, while Thought is really our expression of the one part existing thru the different forms or parts of particles. That is, it has developed with these parts and by so doing has formed in itself the idea of Creation and so likewise becomes a Creator of things. If the Mind or Thought was the Creator

of organic life, it would be a matter of fact that it could unfold the idea of how it created things, just as the buildings, etc., are the result of Thought and development by expression, and after their creation the Thought expresses the idea of how they were created by what is expressed in the things created.

Here we may turn from the present subject to that which also deals with Evolution in that it points facts as given by Spencer, that Language did not originate at some time prior to nature, but is a growth correlative with nature. Spencer says, "Up to quite recent days, Language was held to be of supernatural origin. That this elaborate apparatus of symbols, so marvelously adapted for the conveyance of Thought from one mind to another mind, was a miraculous gift, seemed unquestionable. No possible alternative way could be thought of by which there had come into existence these multitudinous assemblages of words of various orders, genera, and species, moulded into fitness for articulating with one another, and capable of being united from moment to moment into ever-new combinations, that represent with precision each idea as it arises. The supposition that, in the slow progress of things, Language grew out of the continuous use of signs,—at first mainly mimetic, afterward partly mimetic, partly vocal, and at length almost wholly vocal—was an hypothesis never even conceived by man in early stages of civilization,—and when the hypothesis was, at length, conceived, it was thought too monstrous an absurdity to be even entertained. Yet, this monstrous absurdity proves to be true. Already, the evolution

of Language has been traced back far enough to show that all its particular words, and all its leading traits of structure, have had a natural genesis, has been natural from the beginning. Not only has it been natural from the beginning, but it has been spontaneous, Going on without any authority or appointed regulation, this natural process went on without any man observing that it was going on. Solely under pressure of the need for communicating their ideas and feelings—solely in pursuit of their personal interests—men little by little developed speech in absolute unconsciousness that were doing anything more than pursuing their personal interests. Take the whole population of the globe, and there is probably not above one in a million who knows that in his daily talk he is carrying on the process by which language have been evolved.”

So it is with all things existing; we have believed in a God of Creation, and thought it impossible to find out any other way by which things could be created, but Science has pointed out life—the organic, as well as any form of life is due by bringing together different particles in acquisition to conform to the life of that thing, and the life of many forms, and so relieves one of the doubt that has been held in ignorance.

I repeat again that the Mind or Thought really developed thru Creation, or, that it could not develop without the natural, any more than man could express the idea of a building without the materials used. It is also to our sense and thought that things look beautiful to us, since, to the animal none of these things can appear unusual as to beauty. It is only because the Conscience has de-

veloped a state of Thought, that we can express things as beautiful, just as Adam gave the names to things so spoken heretofore; therefore, we should not WONDER AT THE BEAUTY OF THINGS, for we are admiring only what we have developed to admire, just as we have developed to loathe some things, or "there is no good or bad in anything, but thinking makes it so".

So then, God as Thought is above that which is created, in the sense that which is created as material cannot develop higher, and so Thought "overcomes" that which is created, because it has developed above that which is created. The child, not being responsible for Good, ("It is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you"), nor for the Evil. ("Ye are of your Father, the devil, for there is no good in him.") It expresses in life, so it cannot be rewarded after death for the Good—God—it is not responsible for in this life, but is subject—the same in this life,—neither can it be made to suffer after death (it does not exist in any form after death) for the Evil which it is not responsible for in this life, but is likewise subject—the same in this life, since Thought cannot be expressed otherwise than by what is in THIS LIFE which is the only life for man—you.

The aforesaid remark made by Paul is ONLY A HINT, and illustrates those who are so religiously wise and generally complain by saying: "Why did God make us so," or "if there is no other world and life for us hereafter why all this work and turmoil," or "why is it so and so," or "what are we created for," and all such silly rot,

as though things could be otherwise than what they are, when certain conditions exist which make it so. All of the above remarks are the result of selfishness, or it is Evil complaining, since the animal has no Thought and Conscience to complain with. It is not for me to say why am I thus, but it is for me to make the most out of WHAT IS, and NOT THAT THE ACORN CAN SAY TO DEVELOPMENT, "Why hast thou made me thus." It would be just as reasonable to ask "why is there a world?" I cannot say "why hast thou made me thus", because IT IS SO OR, THUSLY, and "I am" as "I am", and will be what I will, because whatsoever the Conscious Thought IS, that IS the life "I am" also. I use the term "this life", or "this world" because there is no other way in which to give an idea of two distinct ideas existing as one condition of life. So, this space will be changed from THIS WORLD to the OTHER WORLD when the Natural Law and condition is abolished—replaced by the Spiritual Law and Thought or God as Wholly existing here, instead of the two present Laws existing, and not the general opinion that the world is to be destroyed, for, in the words of Jesus, "I came not to destroy, but to save the world". Neither THOUGHT—"Good and Evil"—or God and Satan are of the world, nor are they of the body, because they work as "I am" and a body to-day, but to-morrow as John, if I be nothing, therefore it is not John and I who are working independently. Jesus spoke of the body-building—when he said "I can of myself do nothing". Because there is no other term that can be used to express these things and sayings, so

man—you are used as a kind of "THIRD PART" as referred to in Revelation, or a party to the whole, in order that the TWO PARTS—Good and Evil may be distinguished one from the other.

It is reasonable to believe that in Time, Thought in all forms of life will be capable of greater possibilities than we of to-day are able to enjoy. Perhaps there is no more evidence of this than in "Wireless Telegraphy",—and still later is the "Wireless Telephone", this latter only having a partial demonstration to-day. I predict the time is coming when there shall be no use for the Postal Service as far as correspondence is concerned. The proof of this is already discernable by Telepathy, or Transmission of Thought from one person to another. How often we hear of this or that person having "a presentiment" of something about to take place which in some way concerns them, which proves the ever development of Thought to some form or other. (I trust you will not confound this "presentiment" above mentioned with those who claim to see "the departed" or "Spirits", for such can only be classed with some kind of a nervous disorder of which I will prove later is a "disorder"). The proof that Thought is transferred from one person to another in a crude way, or not in a distinct way and apprehension of a thing, is shown in the remark: "talk of the devil and he is sure to appear", because, the person making this remark has received a slight telepathy of the coming of such a person. If you are able to talk with a person by the wireless telephone, then, the only reason preventing one person talking with another at a distance, is because the law of attraction in

this form has not developed, or we might use the term—discovered, yet, the word developed is only proper in the sense that nothing exists until it has developed. I understand “the secret of wireless telegraphy lies in the instrument that attracts”. So, why not believe that the secret which is a secret only because the idea has not developed, is the method that shall attract one person to another, and like in many other things shall take the place of material—wire—or postal means of carrying. It is possible that the persons wishing to attract each other must be of the same temperament, which can be cultivated as in all things, in order to attract each other, just as the instruments used in wireless telegraphy are tuned the same in order to attract the sounds to each other. When the Thought develops the idea of how the electric force in me can send with force my thoughts to a distance, or to another person, then will that person receive my thoughts—be conscious of them, if that person be receptive to my thoughts, or wishes to receive them. I do not believe as some contend, that “thoughts go about in the air, landing here or there, or where no Conscience shall be receptive to them”, since, no Power or Thought can be given to a person, and over another, unless the one person yields the Power to the other, or has no Power and Mind of their own. I would be in hell, and a fool, if I would allow other persons to send me Evil and Thoughts of a character I could not use. How absurd,—to think if some person held to the Thought that I am bad, or sent me such thoughts,—I would be bad—making me subject to what other people Thought. I am subject ONLY to my own Thoughts, and by

being Conscious of the Thought and Power, I have Thought and Power to overcome the Evil influences which may surround me. This is where Christian Scientists and some others are wrong in saying, "You should hold only a Good and Health Thought for this or that person at a distance, or nearby, when that person is Evil or unhealthy, in order to help them", as though such a person could be influenced by my thoughts unless, of course, he knew something about what I am doing and yields to me by his own relaxation of body and Thought, which again, is only a form of mesmerism, since, I am subject to what other people "demonstrate" for me. Such as the above information—"to think good of a person"—is good for people to hold to, for, it is a BENEFIT to those who hold to it, since, holding a good thought of another is a sign of no ill-will toward them. But, that "I am" God and Satan—Good and Evil Thoughts, in individual form, is illustrated in the following of which I have made mention heretofore,—

"Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world, I and my Father are one." This is significant of you—man or Jesus as God, or the Unity of Good or God in individual form of Expression. Then he said, "Ye are of your Father, the devil, and the lust of your father, ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the Truth, because there is no Truth in him." This is significant of you—man or Jesus as Satan or the Unity of Evil or Satan in individual form of Expression. I use the term "you or Jesus" as significant of ALL MEN as MAN or ONE, since all men—bodies are the same, though Jesus was above

the average man, in that he revealed the Truth as he lived it above the average man of his time, just as any inventor is greater or above those to whom he reveals his invention. Note here also, that Satan—"Father"—IS from "the beginning", just as God—"Father"—is in "the beginning", and the same weight is here thrown upon the Father who is the Spirit of Good, as upon the Father who is the spirit of Evil—the word Father in the quotation referring to God being written with a capital F, because the Truth is greater than the error. If these two remarks did not refer to you or man as the Expression of Thought, or as leading two lives in one, then they would be contradictory, as all Bible quotations are if we take them figuratively. Of course, I can understand where some who read these passages will say,—“these remarks were not delivered to the same people, or at the same time and place, and therefore, must refer to different people”. You will ALWAYS note in the religious life and view, a certain class condemning another or saying, “I am glad I am not as other men”, and so they infer that the Evil remark could not allude to THEM, but to the other class. But Jesus said, “There is only one Good and that is God”, so he did not necessarily refer to the people as one class being good and another being evil, only in the sense that he was illustrating THE TWO CLASSES at DIFFERENT TIMES—so the two remarks at different times. These I say pertain to Thought, because they are as it says in “the beginning”, while you—"Ye" as being addressed here, were in the present, and only existing to-day as a body, because you were not in "the

beginning", yet, existing as the Thought by manifestation, just as the good and poor construction of a building is the expression of a good and poor thing—idea of construction as long as **THE BUILDING STANDS**. If in the former pages I have not made it clear that Thought and Power—Thought is Power—are the leading factors in the real life of man, or that it concerns him alone when speaking of his life relation to God, then I trust there shall be plainer facts written in following pages that will convince the most skeptical of the end of the Natural world, and this refers to the end of "the natural man". I here end this chapter by claiming in the same manner of tone spoken heretofore, that—The only God there **IS**, is Man, and the only Satan there **IS**, is Man; but the time is coming when there shall be but One God—one man (man is plural here). To-day, Man leads a **DUAL LIFE**, because both God and Satan exist as Thought, but "the end is not yet", for all have not been able to even think the same, and then, when all think the same, it is but the beginning of the end of the Natural condition, since, Time is required in which to work to one End.

"Now I beseech you, brethen,
By the name of our Lord Jesus
Christ, that ye all speak **THE**
SAME THING, and **THAT** there
Be no diversions among you,—
But **THAT** ye be perfectly joined
Together in the same Mind,
And in the same judgment,
As that of our Lord Jesus Christ".

THE SOUL IS SENSE.

"Jesus said unto them, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy mind".

THERE has so much been said about "the Soul of man", that it seems almost impossible to raise with profit any voice above the many different views, yet, most of the opinions expressed by those who are supposed to be reliable and able thinkers, seem to end the same, or that there is an individual soul of man which exists after death. It is like the idea of most religionists who are preaching a different view of the future state of man, yet believing they will all terminate into the same heaven. They liken or compare their different views with the different roads which lead to a city. This to me is very much in error, though it may seem pleasing because it relieves one of a certain responsibility in finding the true way, since, it is so much EASIER TO GO BY DIFFERENT CHANNELS OR ROADS, because it offers an excuse for not finding and knowing the ONE WAY. We must come into the realization that there is but ONE ROAD which leads to the Truth in anything, as Jesus illustrates in the remark,—“He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up SOME OTHER WAY, the same is a thief and a robber”. Like in my former remarks of the True

God or Thought as living forever, so I will agree that the True Soul of man exists forever, but not in the same meaning as given by some Psychologists, who have only aimed to reveal to us the True Soul. So I have defined the word Soul as that of the word Sense and will verify the facts by thoroughly explaining the same. The Soul is nothing more than the Sense of things, or the Sense of a thing, and exists forever in meaning that any Truth exists forever, while the Soul or Sense of things Natural can only be temporary as its name signifies. What reason would there be in saying man should "love the Lord with all thy soul", if it pertained to the individual as having a Soul existing as an individual? The word "thy", here signifies you, or an individual, and the word Soul signifies Sense because of the word "all" thy in connection with the word Soul, since, "all" signifies strength in proportion, and could be used as part to apply in use with the Soul, or as full strength in connection with the Soul. And when I say "connection with the Soul" as the word "all" is used in this meaning here, it would indicate that the Soul of man, or as an individual could be in parts, which to me would not be much of a man if he were disconnected. Therefore, "thy Soul" is thy Sense of life, and one should use "all" his Sense of life as to what constitutes the Higher Idea in order to reach the Idea. This Sense is also indivisible, but used in connection with the word "thy" in order to give the individuality of the meaning of the Unity of the Soul. To "love the Lord with ALL thy Soul or Sense of a Higher Life, which Higher is Heaven because it is above the Lower or animal Sense of

life, and Heaven because it is the Truth, will in Time, or at the end of Time, be the whole Soul and bodily form of life. The Spiritual Sense then, is the Soul of a thing which exists forever. Like all things, we are coming into a different view, or should view the word Soul as the MEANING of a thing, and when that meaning is thoroughly and properly used, it will develop such as the meaning signifies. And what is this different Sense, but a different Soul! Not that the Soul changes in its Truth of Being, but that the Idea or Truth of Soul changes in man as his Idea of Spiritual life changes. The eternity of the Soul is but the existing qualities that live forever, and these are the only Souls which exist forever. There can be no individual Soul, because it is like as Eternal Thought or God, and True Souls are the Unity of Spirit, yet, the Soul or Sense of a thing appears individual to man because used by individuals. There can be no such a thing as "Soul of man", other than that it exists for the use of man to be a quality thru which he is to make the most of life.

Spencer in quoting Cieza says, "Soul they called *Sonccon*, a word which also means heart", also Crantz tells us the Greenlanders believe in two souls—viz., the shadow and the breath". It remains only to note the progressive differentiation of the conception of the body and soul, which the facts show us, as in the last chapter we saw that, along with the growth of intelligence, the idea of that permanent insensibility we call death, is gradually differentiated from the idea of those temporary insensibilities which simulate it till at length it is marked off as radically unlike; so, here, we

see that the ideas of a substantial self and an unsubstantial self, acquire this strong contrast by degrees; and that increasing knowledge, joined with a critical growing faculty determine the change". Emerson says: "Life will be imaged, but cannot be divided or doubled. Any invasion of its unity would be chaos. The Soul is not twin-born but the only begotten, and though revealing itself as child in time, child in appearance, is of a fatal and universal power, admitting of no co-life."

To claim God or Thought is Eternal is to claim Soul is Eternal, but when you claim there is a Soul of man, you take away the Eternity and Unity of the Soul, or make an individual of the Soul. Jesus said: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the Soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Though men are able to destroy the body as in war, yet they are not able by such means to destroy the Sense or Soul, or Senses or Souls which the man embodies, since they are qualities that can only be destroyed by Thought. The first part of the verse alludes to what I have just said—as in war, are those "which kill the body", and concerns the individual directly, while the latter part of the verse refers to the Soul or Sense that is embodied by the form or individual. The Natural or Sense of Error is that which rightly destroys the body thru disease, and the result is "both soul and body in hell", since the man's Soul or Sense is lost with the body—that is, the body is certainly of no use to that man when his Sense of Reason is lost, and THEN IS, "both soul and body in hell". So then, the ONE, or "him which

is able to destroy both soul and body in hell", is Satan—the sinful Thought, and not as generally believed a God at one time lovely, and at another time filled with hatred. The Sense of Error which is Evil Thought, is that which destroys the Sense of Truth which is Eternal, and THEN AND THERE THE BODY ALSO, for, such a condition IS HELL for that man, and not "will be hell hereafter" for that individual.

You cannot destroy the Truth, nor even the Error of a thing by destroying the body—building. The ignorant people had this experience with Jesus and others, and in fact, all growth of knowledge given by those who have made Science a Study, have at one time or another fallen by the ax of those who were in power to wield it, but you will note the words of Truth live after the death or destruction of that body. The Christ Idea and Sense of a thing is never destroyed because you have destroyed the body, as this body is referred to in the first part, yet, the Sense of Error and body (Soul and body) will eventually be destroyed, for this is the work of Truth to destroy the Error. Man under the Sense and fire of Error, or Soul of Error is subject to diseased conditions, and therefore a fit subject for hell, because the condition of that body IS HELL from the very fact that the Soul or Sense of that man IS ROTTEN. If your body is diseased, you can only lay the Cause in most and extreme cases to the Sense, "WHICH" is responsible for the disease, since the body can "TAKE NO THOUGHT OF ITSELF", therefore only subject to the Sense of Thought it embodies. Spencer says, "For of the Soul, the body form doth

take, For Soul is form and doth the body make." It stands to reason that only in the form of Soul as Sense could the condition of the body be formed—changed, not as to the shape—form of the body, but the conditions of that body. It is the Spiritual Sense which builds the body—Spiritual form. It being the Spiritual Sense or Soul that lives forever, such a Sense of life Thought will bring about the Spiritual form of man. But, as referred to, man has, and does generally hold to the opinion that Soul is really a separate entity from God, or that it refers to man independently and individually and specifically, whereas, it is the Essence of God or Thought used in the form of the Soul of man in order to designate Thought in a more universal form, because the word "Souls" is used in some passages. Jesus said "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give rest unto your Souls". This here refers to the Senses—Souls of a single person—which Senses are at unrest in all walks of life, yet, it could here be referred to individuals and still not lose its indivisibility. The Eternity of the Soul is but the Eternity of Truth in Expression which man embodies in what we call "this world" and no "other world" as yet, for, there is no other world but IN NAME ONLY thus far. In this Sense the Soul IS Eternal, which, of course, is the Soul FOR MAN, and for ALL MEN. The time was when there was no Sense or Soul of anything, but, each generation unfolds by development a much more faculty. It would be just as well to abandon this word "Soul" for that of Truth, if we could realize the Truth thru any other channel than the Sense,

but, as the Sense of Truth can only be realized by what is termed the Senses, or the Sense of a thing,—we can conclude the Soul inevitable. You will perhaps say, “Why not use the word Sense then instead of the word Soul, if the word Soul is a synonym to Sense. But the word Soul is separate from the word Sense when the word Sense is applied to individuals, from the very fact that one man is not directly responsible for the Sense which another man holds of a thing; therefore, Sense can be used instead of Soul because of the actual Truth of the indivisibility of the Soul. Also, the word Sense can be applied in many and more proper ways of usage than the word Soul, just as the word Spirit is used in a sentence to express the same meaning as the word God. To my thinking, Soul is a synonym to Truth and man when it is applicable to Truth and man, but when it applies to Error, it is synonymous to Error, from the very fact that there are different Senses of Truth and Error. So I say again, that some Psychologists write concerning the immortality of the Soul as that which is the Soul of each or individual man that lives forever, instead of the Real Soul of man. They write like preachers preach—not from experience and observation of what **HERE IS LIFE**—“this **IS** life eternal”; but on the principle of, or thought of what they “believe” **IS A LIFE HEREAFTER**, or a continued life of that person. They do not think, but “**BELIEVE**” and so write and preach from **MERE BELIEF ONLY**, thereby making “**THE WORDS OF GOD OF NONE EFFECT**” **HERE**. They are not thinkers, but, merely “believers”, as one Prof. Barnes who

claims the name of a Psychologist, says: "Thinkers are a detriment to the people generally." This is the substance of one of his lectures I listened to recently. So he believes and as he said, "I expect to be up there looking down on the people,"—which rot is **THE RESULT OF BELIEF ONLY UPON THEORY**, and not the belief derived from experience and observation, and hinders the Christ Idea of life that should be lived here as Jesus taught and lived to the best of his ability, and it cannot be lived here, if it is taught that such, or the Spiritual life shall be lived in another world, or that we should prepare ourselves to live it in another world. The idea too, that the Soul or Spirit leaves the body is absurd, and when they tell you this, they, too, are **SEEING THINGS** from mere belief. The body is that Spirit or Soul Expression so long as this or that body exists, just as the Thought is manifested by the body. We know the Soul and the Thought as the body is known. We see the Soul and Thought of man by the action—body of that man. If you could see and "believe" that the Spirit or Soul leaves the body, then you could observe and believe that the Truth leaves the body. It would be absurd to "believe" you could make a diagnosis of Truth, other than that it is expressed by what exists in Truth. Man is just as much of Truth as he Expresses, and Truth is just as much of man as it is expressed. Because man embodies Spirit, and a Sense of Truth and Error, it is not to be construed into a fact that they **ARE IN THE BODY**, but **ARE THAT BODY MEANINGLY**. You may easily form the opinion, or believe that Spirit leaves the body, if

you could hold to the idea that it was, or is in the body. A spoken word is the form or expression Thought, and is embodied in that Thought, and the Thought is not a Thought until it exists bodily, nor is the Thought in a body, but a state of Conscience manifestly so, nor is it LOCATED THERE as an individual Consciousness, but in a state of continuity and passing Conscience as indivisible. I claim all there is to Spirit is what is Expressed, and all there is to Soul is the Sense of a thing expressed, and all there is to man is what he expresses in the visible, because there is no such thing as that which is invisible, though the common version and general opinion is that there exists an Invisible God, or that God is Invisible. You take a piece of paper and drop it where the wind is, and it will move and sway according to the wind, and thereby expresses the movement of the wind, (Spirit), but, THE WIND IS NOT IN IT—the paper, (body). Yet it embodies the wind because of its movement. If the wind were in it, then would the wind be subject to control by it, and thereby would seem individual. The paper would then control it just as a man would control an apple held in his grasp. Neither is the paper IN the wind (Man cannot be in Spirit) but it becomes A PART of the wind, or we may say, is the wind in itself, and like man, is the individual expression of the wind, as man is the individual expression of the Spirit and is that spirit in itself. When the paper becomes absorbed (burned or decayed) or not a part of the wind by expression of movement, it is just the same as man who is not able after death (decayed) to express the Spirit, the Soul,

the Thought or God of life, yet, the Spirit, etc., is seen by other bodies by Expression, just as the wind continues to move and is seen by other material bodies.

Jesus said "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." In other words, no man can define Thought or Spirit, other than what is expressed in life, just as the wind is not definable only as it is seen by its direction, and cannot especially go anywhere, nor come from any place, therefore, it neither cometh nor goeth, but IS. So IS every man that is born of the Spirit—the same action as that Spirit by body manifestation. While Soul, Sense, Spirit, etc., are not defined the same as solids, they are no less components. In speaking of the Natural, Jesus said, "No man can see God at any time and live." That is, no Natural Sense of a thing can stand before the Spiritual Sense of a thing and live,—man being used as the form of either Sense Working. If the above referred to Man individually and specifically, or figuratively, it would contradict the saying: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall SEE God". The "pure in heart" cannot avoid seeing God, because God is seen only as the pure in heart is manifested.

It is recorded in the Bible that Jesus said to the doubtful Thomas, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Jesus was not living, though we find "he said" these words. I might mention here the fact that mesmerism, though not known as such in those days, played a very

prominent part in the life of Jesus and latter days of the disciples. The above remark seemed to come from Jesus because of a SELF mesmeric state. This illustrates their OWN THINKING—of the eleven disciples—directed to one—Thomas who could not see as they “believed”. It was a kind of ventriloquial expression of their thought coming from the vision of Jesus, and it certainly was a “vision”, since he—Jesus could no more exist after the Natural death, than any other of his time, or the present time. This was a very good “doctrine” in those days, or any “adulterous generation SEEKING A SIGN”, or looking to the future, or looking for Christ or God or Spirit, etc., of life in form, other than man expressing it—which really is seeing it. So, I think we are advanced to-day because we have more MEN like the “doubtful” Thomas. He was THE ONLY MAN OUT OF TWELVE, who did not believe in visions, or insane ideas, and so, had no FEAR of expressing his feelings when he did not understand a thing, and THIS IS ALL that this verse illustrates in reality. The other disciples very plainly show their cowardice and ignorance from the very fact that Jesus HAD PREVIOUSLY “REBUKED them MANY TIMES for their LACK of UNDERSTANDING”. They dare not “ask any more questions”, so they “believed”. This verse illustrates how true in life it is, or how ignorant, people would remain if there were no Thomases to ask questions when in doubt. The Professor talks on a subject before a class of students, and afterwards questions them as to their understanding of the subject. They exclaim “we know”, (“believe”), but they do not

rise to explain why they know, yet, one who is not afraid to admit his ignorance, arises from among them saying, "I do not understand". The Professor proves by showing thru a demonstration of the subject, instead of by words or parable only, and thru this one—Thomas, are all in the class made wise to it. I will agree that Jesus appeared to the disciples in a VISIONARY WAY, and that "the resurrection" but signified the then visionary idea of the Truth. This visionary sight was due to the constant thought of seeing Jesus, for, if it were true that Jesus appeared, we might well say the ground taken by Spiritualists is a fact regarding "Spirit manifestation", etc. But as Jesus "CHOSE" his disciples, and as all who accept such are the same temperament, we can conclude they were and are easily brought under such a state of seeing, which, of course, was and is a good thing for them and all who live under the age of superstition and view of the future, for, "where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise", or, as one priest said, "if our cult get along better thru keeping them in ignorance, it is better for them and those about them." And so the Soul has been preached to man by those who really know better, but in order to reach their own end of Power and wealth, the teaching continues to stand for Truth.

In Luke 12:19-20 we read,—“And I will say to my Soul, Soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry.” “But God said, unto him, Thou fool! this night thy Soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?” Here, we have in the first quotation, the

illustration of Conscious self. "I will say to my Soul"—man conscious of an Evil Sense, or a selfish Evil claiming its own. In the next verse we have the illustration of Man being Conscious of the opposite, for "God said unto him"—Man Conscious of unselfishness, since, we find the Higher Thought replacing the Lower Thought by the expression—"thou fool" when the Higher appeared. How truly this illustrates the Natural Sense or Soul of man as he thinks only of self, and like all thought of a future pleasure and heaven as a locality, he is, at any time, liable to leave behind him the opportunity to live and enjoy life as he travels. We hear people say as the above illustrates,—"I will work hard and accumulate for so many years, and then take my ease". They little realize the overburden they are heaping upon themselves, for, the result is sometimes felt, because the overwork and too much thought for the future has crowded **TOO MANY DAYS INTO ONE DAY**. Then too, "thou fool!" this might be your last, and "those things" which you have stored away will not benefit you. We spend too much time and worry over "our children", as though they, and even those who are related otherwise, have no chance as we have had in the world to make a living. We are a detriment, when we do not allow the same talent to work in those following as it works in us. This is the Natural Sense or Soul taken from the child that should develop in it.

If, according to Spencer, "The Soul is form and doth the body make", it is my understanding that the Natural Soul or Sense of life is the body manifestation of this life, and unavoidable because of

the present and former Natural Condition, and to remove the same as Cause, in a way, we should in order to bring about the Spiritual body manifestation only,—use the Spiritual Soul or Sense of life as Cause, which, of course, can only be accomplished thru the Thought Sense, thereof, as Jesus says, “with ALL thy Soul, and with all thy mind”—Thought. Paul speaks of this, or I define it as such, when he said,—“The first man Adam was made a living Soul; the last Adam WAS made a quickening Spirit. “Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual.” You who claim “there is no matter”, as in Christian Science, and Mental Science, must here deny Paul, as well as any proved Physical conditions. This, as I have mentioned in the preceding chapter, alludes to the Physical or Nature existing prior to the Spiritual or Evolution of Thought or God. The TWO Adams represent Matter and Spirit—“the first man Adam” was Adam after the flesh, which had a different “Soul” or Sense of Life and lived accordingly. “The last Adam”—called Jesus, and Adam because of the flesh relation—represents the Spirit or Mental, and living more accordingly. So then, Thought concerning the Spiritual life or God TO BE ALL IN ALL, is the immortality of the Soul or Sense that IS, but Thought NOW concerning the Natural life that IS, is not the Immortal life that shall be and is not. Note how the word “IS” is used by Paul. He does not say nor claim that God, or the Spiritual WAS Spiritual or FIRST, because, if God was the origin or Creator, it should read, howbeit, that IS not first which

WAS Spiritual, but it says, Howbeit, that WAS NOT FIRST which IS Spiritual. The word "is", following the word "was", is significant that the Spiritual "WAS NOT FIRST".

In Revelation 16: 3, it reads, "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea." In this verse I give the definition of Angel as that of Thought and "the sea" as that of man or "nations". "Blood" signifies essential life, and "Soul" signifies Sense. The Truth which the "vial" or vessel of understanding contained, is given—"poured upon the sea"—to the people, and "became as the blood—life—of a dead man", because it—the Truth appeared as "dead" to man, but now received as the "blood"—life of man, and therefore caused the destruction of the Natural Senses, or Souls of life, for, "every living soul" or Sense of things died in the sea—minds of the people. If you still hold to the idea that you have an individual soul to lose or to retain; it should be silenced here, because "EVERY living soul died", and would indicate no chance for any living being or soul to live. But it is "every living" Sense of a material nature shall be abolished or "die" or be destroyed when it shall have run its course which shall be at the End of Time when the Spiritual Sense shall be Absolute.

Emerson says: "Because the Soul is progressive, it never quite repeats itself, but in every act attempts the production of a new and fairer whole." Now, if the Soul or Sense of a thing was settled, or did not advance as Time and Thought advanced—developed, we might "believe" or even think

each individual man had a Soul. But, my Soul to-day (not mine either), is not the Soul or Sense of to-morrow, only in the degree that it reasons and lives the same to-morrow. It is the work then of what we call the individual Soul of man, or a Sense that is Natural that must either grow into a Spiritual Sense of things, that such a State of Perfection is reached. Now, if the average man or individual had the work to do, we could not conceive of such Perfection, because man generally views from things that appear material and in form as it exists to-day, rather than accept the Universal Thought of development. He believes because he sees man to-day in one light, that he should always remain so here, but change hereafter, when really there is no other place for him to work, since, "God is not the God"—Work "of the dead, but of the living". Job said, "MY Soul chooseth death", because the Evil had worked in him to such an extent that he suffered disease of the flesh, and so the Sense or Soul could only release itself from suffering by death, since there could be no suffering in that body after the Sense of life became extinct in such a bodily form. We can now see or should see by experience and observation ("Judge by the signs of the times") that such forms of life in disease are not the true forms of Spiritual life. The asylums and such like are but the land-marks to a thing that should not stand. It is time we should not care to experience these things ourselves, in order to prove them, but should learn thru the experience of others that **HERE** and **NOWHERE ELSE** is Perfection reached. Persons will then say, "if I ever arrive at such a condition wherein

I have lost my Soul—Sense of Reason, I trust I shall not be placed in such asylums; for I shall be useless and an expense to the public, and care not to take the chance of regaining my Soul”, which is the only Soul or Sense that can exist and can be lost, and which is lost to that man only as a bodily existence, since, the Good and Evil Souls—Senses live on until the Evil Sense is destroyed by the Good Sense.

Let us deal here with what are termed the different Senses used, and we shall find that the one great Sense is what I have defined as that of Reason and the Sense referred to in the Bible of Revelation as that of the “Seventh Angel” or last Sense to be reached. Not but what we have had reason for some time, just as we have had the Sense of this or that, but that they have not always been defined as such. We have believed there were but “five Senses”, namely,—Taste, Smell, Touch, Hearing and Sight”, but these are not now considered complete, as there are now what may be termed “Sensations of Organic life” and called the “Sixth Sense”. It includes the feeling of Hunger, Thirst, Suffocation, etc. So then, we have the Sense of Taste, the Sense of Smell, the Sense of Touch, the Sense of Hearing, the Sense of Sight, and the Sense of Thirst, which are the Six Senses, and are embodied or formed by man and also animals having brain and nerve. Such animals and the primitive state of man have these Senses and need have no Conscience and Thought in order to have these Senses. Man, after the Thought and Conscience developed, received the Sense of Right and Wrong, therefore the Sense of Reasoning which

100 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

I define as the Seventh Sense and the Soul, which can be termed the Thought of Good and Evil working.

Jesus said, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own Soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his Soul?" In other words, What profit would it be for me to gain riches, and then lose my Sense and live in some asylum? Neither can a man give all these riches which he has gained for his Soul, or the return of it, or "give in exchange", to regain the Sense he has lost, because this is something money cannot buy. Man must of himself be this Truth, for, by living the Truth, he retains the Soul or Sense of Reason he might have lost, and thereby manifests more the Real Sense of life and "Mind which was in Christ Jesus". Jesus said concerning this Truth, "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it,—and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." That is, he that shall be Conscious of the Spiritual life, shall not be Conscious of the Natural life, or "lose HIS life", and he that shall be Conscious of the Natural life, shall not be Conscious of the Spiritual life, or "save his life". The body is the "sign" of either Consciousness. To be Conscious of God is to save the Soul to that extent by Reason saves the Soul of them hereafter, since, by propogation of a Good Sense are they who inherit by propogation subject to the things inherited, which is to say the more the Higher Sense or Soul is developed, just that much more of God or Good Thought exists.

If some one had not revealed the Truth, as a Higher Sense of life than what may be termed

the Natural or animal nature, it is safe to say ere this time the whole generation would have been idiotic, since Evil—over sexual indulgence or the Natural Evil is the only true Cause for such a condition. Jesus was simply the first and only ONE to recognize this, and so he gave up “HIS LIFE”—the Natural, or “DIED FOR US” in order to “save the world” from such a state as also referred to by Paul in Romans 1:26–27. Many a parent, if they have not seen their own Soul—Sense lost in themselves, have seen it lost in themselves by their offspring. Some of the offspring do not inherit so much of the Sensual Sense or Soul, because the Sense of Evil is not so prominent in the parent Conscience at one time as at another, nor is it the same always during pregnancy. The child inherits these evils if the mother has any desire of some evil during pregnancy,—also, this may be while the child is nursing. Neither does the whole fault lay with the mother for the hereditary and certain evil and diseased conditions of the child, since the seed of the father may be infected with the germ of evil and disease. One case I note in particular was a woman, who, while in “carrying” gave birth to two boys at two different states of feeling, and both turned out in life—after maturity to be just the type she had held in Conscience during pregnancy. She had proclaimed for one the love of lust and the other a fondness for books—she, having a liking for books and reading the same almost continually at the one time, while at the other time, she thought only of the sex indulgence part of life. This is her statement, and I believe it, because it had long been my observation with

102 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

other cases which I had made in its study. A case comes to my mind now, of a woman demanding whiskey while she was in a pregnant state, to such an extent that the husband thought it best to give in and so procured the same and she indulged in it like one in great thirst for water, and the result was she became very sick. As soon as she regained her normal condition, she did not care to drink any more, in fact it became sickening to her thought. The result was that after the child became of age, it could never bear even the sight of liquor. If the mother had not been satisfied with her liking and taking of the whiskey when she wanted it and then and there destroyed the appetite for it, the chances are the child would have "hankered" after it later in life. This is a case of hereditary, and we can give many proofs of its work, which, though we find many who believe to the contrary because of their misinterpretation of passages in the Old Testament. So the Soul is under the same hereditary influence as any form of life. We read where Richard said, "My soul and body on the action both," and we find many Richards after his making. This Soul is not the action of a Good Sense, but the action of an Evil Soul because it acts in the work of destruction. It also shows the "action" of the Evil Soul by the action of the "Body", or "both", or that the body acts with the Sense, or each IS AS THE OTHER, therefore, in the words of Spencer, "the soul is form and doth the body make." We speak of the Soul as immortal, and we speak of man as immortal. When you say "Shakespeare is Immortal", I agree that Shakespeare, Plato, Socrates, Jesus and the like are Immortal, be-

cause their words of Truth live forever, or are Immortal, but NOT THAT Shakespeare, Plato, Socrates, Jesus and the like are Immortal. My parents are Immortal in so far that their words of Truth live, because their words live by me, but my parents are not immortal. Let us remember then, only that which is Truth is Eternal, or that God as Thought is Eternal, and Immortal, and by so doing we shall be PARTAKERS, since, we have "PART IN THE RESURRECTION"—SOME KNOWLEDGE of building up a Soul and Body that is Eternal now in the Principle of Thought, but shall at the end of Time be embodied as such in the Visible, or as a Whole Soul which is Eternal, instead of the present dual life of the moral and immoral Soul or Sense of life.

"He may live without books—what is knowledge but grieving?

He may live without hope—what is hope but deceiving?

He may live without love—what is passion but pining?

But where is the man that can live without dining?"

MEREDITH.

He that loseth passion, shall grow in Knowledge, since passion hath no time for Truth.

THE RESURRECTION IS KNOWLEDGE.

"I am the Resurrection and the Life".

It has been only in the preceding chapters to give the idea that God and Satan are Thought, and that the Soul is Sense of Thought which will bring about the final results, with a Knowledge—that it is so, and so, in this chapter all are and must be associated with in order to give rise to the Knowledge that Resurrection is nothing more than Knowledge, since its name can only be associated with the word Knowledge instead of a belief that it refers to a person being resurrected, yet, that person on whom the Knowledge is given, shall be resurrected above that which is below, therefore "the Resurrection"—and likewise the Knowledge to attain the Resurrection. Jesus said, "I am the resurrection and the Life." (i.e.) He gave out the knowledge of a Spiritual life to be lived, therefore "the resurrection", but "NOT THAT LIFE". How absurd and void of meaning would this remark be, ("I am"), if you should apply it to the idea that Jesus was "resurrected from the dead" when he here was teaching what the meaning of the resurrection would do, and not that it applied to an after death, as is the general opinion put forth. Jesus made the above reply, when the same opinion was put to him about man living or being resurrected as an individual. Martha said, "I know my brother shall

rise in the last day." But Martha should, and all should know that then and there—here—this Knowledge—Resurrection should take place. It says in another part of the Bible, and just because of this remark being written in another part of the Bible does the writing seem to refer to another life, and so seem to contradict each other. "For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." I will allude to this passage farther on in the work, or give it more note and definition, but allude to it here just to make it appropriate with the other just given that it alludes to the same in that,—in the Knowledge of a Higher—Spiritual Thought of life here, you will not marry, because you have outgrown the Natural condition, therefore "the resurrection".

Heaven signifies a Higher state of life reached, therefore, above the Lower—Earth state of life—Natural condition. While the knowledge of this may be known by a few, as the knowledge of a thing is generally known by a few, it shall in time be known by and be more universally lived, as all knowledge when it is revealed by the one who has made a certain Science a study, has failed to reach the majority at the time revealed. So this knowledge is "grieving" to that person as it was to Jesus, since, to a certain extent it is almost impossible to go against the inevitable and known existing conditions of a majority, because you are generally subject to like conditions, and because of the majority in ridicule.

Perhaps the most intricate of all passages and the one subject innermost in man is that which con-

106 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

cerns the resurrection. The reason I suppose is the natural tendency to be always looking and thinking of the future. We give more time to seeking than doing, for, after we have sought and found we fail to act, but keep on seeking in a way, and always overlooking that which seems an ever present fact. It is not because we are unwilling to act, that our progress is always hindered, but for fear of going astray, or to find sometimes our expectations at the end much less satisfactory to us because anticipation is generally greater than realization. This to me is a proof and very illustrative of a Truth, that it is not wise to look and anticipate for the future, other than that which seems a reasonable present in the "hope" of gaining a better end. Like Meredith, I do not approve so much of the word "hope", to an end that may be impossible, and as it is generally used, but sometimes use it for the want of a better one in the act of explanation. To hope for a thing will not bring it, because hoping for a thing cannot produce it. It is the WORKING FOR A THING which will produce it. "Hope is deceiving" because you may hope for something which is in direct contradiction to Progress and Reason, or what may not be beneficial to you nor those with whom you come in contact. So, if you work for, instead of hoping for, you are more liable to receive a thing, yet, do not even work for a thing that may be unreasonable at the end, as you are now hoping for a life which does not concern you now and here. There are quite a few hoping for, and even working for a something they shall not receive in the end, which same is due to believing in the resurrection as per-

taining to another life after this, but as they will not know the difference after death, and find some comfort in the same while living, let them "hope" and "believe" so long as they do not continue as of old, in forcing and drawing others in the same net. Hope is used like the words "Love" and "Knowledge"—very often misused—and though the word Knowledge may be used correctly, it does not always bring happiness, as Meredith says—"it is grieving" to that person using and living it as he sees it is so. The ignorant person, like the animal, drifts along with circumstances, taking no thought of Progress and making none, and yet receiving at times, more happiness out of life than the average person with Knowledge. The majority of people go about their work each day, never dreaming of the Truth, while the Truth silently works its way to the surface when it becomes more recognized and cannot be lost to sight, or "hidden" as it has been heretofore. People with a knowledge of better conditions which can be reached thru this Knowledge, suffer under the load of trying to convince others of a better life, and also of being held up to ridicule. Jesus and Paul suffered by having the knowledge of the fact that the Spiritual life was to be lived here, and also because they could not continue to live the life that was and is more universally lived. But when the Conscience takes on this Knowledge, it is impossible to live otherwise, since it is hard to "go against Conscience", and that man IS just as his Conscience is. To convince others to live the same as he did was the work of Truth, but of course, impossible to do so, and is impossible to-day to live such, in

108 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

a universal way or wholly. "Knowledge is grieving" until it becomes universal, because until then, like in every walk of life, the burden is borne by one or a few, as in the case of Jesus regarding his Knowledge—Resurrection of a Higher Life. It is the universally living, or alike, which produces the harmony in a community, whether it be right or whether it be wrong, or whether it be Good, or whether it be Evil. Great men have suffered, and even put to death—Jesus was of this type—because they spoke before their time—had Knowledge of so and so—yet, such Knowledge as they taught in their day is being more universally lived and believed to-day,—so, while the Knowledge was and is a grief to that person, and therefore the burden to one man because not universally lived, it is to-day and will be in time to come, though it may be thousands of years before that state is universally reached,—a blessing to many, as REFERRED to by Jesus. "And it came to pass, as he spoke these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed IS the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. "But he said, Yea, rather blessed ARE they that hear the word of God and keep it. "For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck."

It is ignorance of how to obtain wealth that places man in a poor condition generally,—therefore, a Knowledge of how to do and invest understandingly, is the way by which you shall become wealthy. We must admit, however, that many wealthy persons are somewhat responsible for the

conditions of poverty, because they have taken too much advantage of the poor and ignorant. But, it has been proven in the poor man that there be those who if they had the opportunity to be dishonest in a business way, they would do likewise, so it is not money and the business that make men better or worse, but that men themselves to deal honestly with each other. The "cash registers" make men honest, but they do not make honest men.

Ignorance in everything is being replaced with knowledge. People who thru ignorance have been and are paying most all their living to religion and the like, thereby starving themselves while those few to whom they give their all are living in luxury and even sin according to Truth are becoming wise to the fact that it is not necessary to buy the Truth, or to erect expensive monuments in memory to it. Jesus taught the multitude and said "the poor have the gospel preached to them", when he could not obtain a hearing in the Church. The Church has done, and is doing some good, as there is good and bad in every person, but that Church which objects to the Truth cannot stand forever.

We might here turn our attention to "alms" and "prayer", as they have been so much misused in taking advantage of the ignorant; I say ignorant, because if they had a Knowledge of the Truth and to what this money was really used for, they would not give it. "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven." "Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee as the hypocrites do in the synagogues, and in the streets that they may

have the glory of men, Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward." When man gives alms "to be seen of men" it is generally for, OUTWARD SHOW, and this is "THEIR REWARD", because that was all it was given for. If the alms are given with a spirit of Love for the cause, it IS "the reward of the Father", because it is in harmony with the Father—Thought of doing a good act. Why is it that Societies work thru this channel of OUTWARD SHOW for receiving help? Simply because they know the weakness of mortality—man in the sight of man—thereby incriminating themselves and those women whom Societies employ to work man in gaining alms, since it is an Evil method by which they secure help ACCORDING TO THE ABOVE PASSAGE, and not because I think and say so here. They—the heads of Societies, etc., are pleased to "Sound a trumpet"—allow it to be seen of men when in the act of giving, if they can gain money by so doing. I remember when attending a Church recently, that, during the hour for service, a large amount of money was asked for by the minister. One man gave a thousand dollars, and then the minister "sounded a trumpet" by saying "Mr. Jones gives a thousand dollars," and then, more trumpets were sounded, for, Mr. Jones and others, were not the only persons present who wished notoriety, or outward show, which is hypocritical to the Spirit of almsgiving. The woman who "gave all her savings" only illustrates the Spirit of giving, but does not signify that man should give if he is not able to do so, or unless he wishes to do so, though he is taught in that light, and sometimes made poor, financially and Spirit-

ually also, since, no man with any reason can understand why he should be a slave to poverty to become a Christian. You cannot receive the Truth by simply paying your money to another person. The kind "to be seen of men" is worked in the streets by Societies, also, Hospitals, and some of the latter even go so far as to label man with a tag, like unto a dog tax. "They have their reward". The free giving by this method is the cause of increased "Relief Societies" which are springing up continually, since many persons are pleased to hold the positions in office at high salaries that are connected with them, and they are about the only persons generally benefited. The business firms are so annoyed by the solicitors for this and that, that they are beginning to cry against it, and yet they dare not speak their mind too freely, for fear of their business being impaired by what these persons may say. These persons know this; and so continue in their hypocrisy—hypocrisy because they know they are taking advantage of the business man's situation, who assists things sometimes that he would not assist otherwise, because it may be against his views, and to support anything contrary to your view may be to hinder Progress. Just so long as man is greedy—and we are now living in the generation of greed—for gain of money and power over his fellow man, just that long will Charity exist, and NO LONGER, since, to recognize a more equality in the distribution of profits, so will such equality and more social relations remove charity, because charity will have no chance to exist where such social economics exist. Only when we come into the understanding above the

112 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

view held by the ignorant, as illustrated by the woman when she said: "yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table", then, will charity begin to cease. The ignorant—poor—will not look up to charity as their end, but to the conditions which cause such an end.

To-day, the individual beggar seeking help from persons on the street, even when he really needs and ought to have assistance, is arrested, while those in the same business, but under the guise of some charity organization, are allowed to go unmolested. But the individual beggar is made a pauper and a beggar at times, because he receives such help, and so does Charity exist under the same rule. If he always looks to others, rather than trying to aid himself thru his own talent, then the talent is lost on account of insufficient usage. This is what it refers to when it says: "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." Again, "Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents, and cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness." The "unprofitable servant" in any problem of life is the lost "talent", and not the man, yet, that man is lost to a certain extent because of the lost talent—"unprofitable servant". It is my aim all along to prove that you and I are but the object of the subject, or, whatever the subject may be you are the object to that subject, and therefore subject to it. Neither do I aim to condemn another, or a Church, because I seem to differ here from another. I only use their views in point-

ing out my knowledge of the Truth—If you have followed me thru all the chapters, you have found that “I blame no man”, but that the conditions are due to Evolution along the Natural and Spiritual lines of growth, as signified by the words of Jesus when he said “if a man hear my words and do them no I condemn him not”. I fully realize with Jesus that no man is to blame if he be Catholic or Protestant. Whatever the subject may be, he is the object of that subject, whether it be Protestant or Catholic. If I take on a condition different than another, or change from what I have been, it is because of conflicts between several conditions being analyzed to whatever produces one. I employ the word knowledge and ignorance to denote distinction and not to claim you have no knowledge, or that you are ignorant. You are simply ignorant of what my knowledge is of the Truth, and until you can prove to me that your knowledge is the Truth, then, your knowledge is a case of ignorance to me. But I believe I have proof that my knowledge is the Truth by what I am able to prove in experience, while your knowledge has outgrown its truthfulness.

In speaking of Charity, Emerson rightly says, “There is a class of persons to whom by all spiritual affinity I am bought and sold; for them I will go to prison if need be,—but your miscellaneous popular charities,—the education at college of fools; the building of meeting-houses to the vain end to which many now stand, alms to sots, and thousand-fold Relief Societies;—though I confess with shame I sometimes succumb and give the dollar, it is is a wicked dollar, which by and by, I shall have

the manhood to withhold." There are many "Relief Societies" springing up because of this free giving, or willing to give, until they have become a pestilence.

We have found here that "almsgiving" is not a help to spiritual growth, and I will follow by giving a few hints as to prayer used to as much profit, or that audible and knee praying has "received its reward", because it is nothing more than a "noise" and a stimulant which only benefits like a medicine as a stimulant benefits the sick person at THE TIME TAKEN, but does not really cure the sick any more than a prayer will cure the sinful. The word prayer in its true definition is DESIRE. I believe this is also the definition given by Mrs. Eddy. Jesus said, "this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." Now then, prayer being desire and my definition of the word "fasting" meaning to ABSTAIN from, therefore the only "prayer and fasting" is a DESIRE TO, AND AN ABSTAINING from sin, which will bring RESULTS. This prayer and fasting refers to the sexual indulgence, and is the REAL FLESH, and not the flesh of animals. Religion has always preached AN EXCUSE for the Truth, and then asks in the name of Pilate, "What is Truth?" It is readily then to conceive the idea that to "pray to"—have a desire to—will change the Cause, and the Effect will change likewise. Jesus said, "Pray to your Father in secret" because Desire to be as the Thought, is significant that your wish is fathered by the desire, and "secret" because within, or that all things are secrets until observed as without, or in the world, and proving the inefficiency of au-

dible prayer because Thought only works as it IS Thought.

There is no Sense then in praying, but, having the DESIRE TO be Good or God, necessarily confirms the idea that you will be "with your Father",—the Truth of ONE BEING in ONE THOUGHT, and you receive the answer, because you will not "ask amiss", as you always do when you pray—you miss the true mark.

We will now turn our attention to "the day of judgment". My Knowledge of it is, or that it refers to the day of understanding, and not that we are to be judged according to our works here at some future time. To illustrate the fact that judgment can be defined as understanding, we will place a prisoner in a court room. The case is argued, and before the jury can pass judgment, they must have a thorough understanding of the case, therefore the day of judgment is the day of understanding, or the case is understood and judged then and there, or on the same day, or at the same time, so, we are judged and condemned hourly in some form of punishment. The prisoner is not always judged and condemned as he may expect to be, nor are we judged and condemned hourly as we may expect to be, or as it looks to us sometimes when we see a person is not caught at once and condemned as we think he ought to be dealt with, which is simply a matter of changed conditions, and whatever the conditions are, he can only be subject to it, whether it be freedom, or whether it be bondage.

The day of judgment then has its connection with the "second coming", because in the day of understanding we have a better judgment of what the

116 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

second coming refers to. To illustrate, we will say that a prophecy is fulfilled by the tendency to believe in the thing prophesied, as thought develops by holding in conscience the thing to be. Even the individual when told by the ordinary "fortune teller" that they are going to experience that or this, or marry a certain person, will come true sometimes. They are told a certain type of person will marry them, and so this thought is continually with them, and being conscious of the same it works to an end. It begins to work more as soon as some person of that type appears before them, (the same person might have appeared before them heretofore, but could make no real impression because no special thought of them), and they begin to plan to meet, because such was told them, and such may continue until the thing comes true. The prophecy, or "the second coming" is the general opinion, and therefore has brought about the second coming, but not in the form of Jesus, but in the form of a better understanding of what Truth is. Neither is it because of any forethought or predestination and the like, other than "The Christ", or "the Messiah" came in the form of Jesus at one time because it was prophesied and then held in Conscience as the Thought developed to such a State of being Expressed by man in the name of Jesus, but not because of a God as Personal making or predestining it so. So then, the "second coming" in one Sense is possible NOW, because of the Sense and Knowledge of what Truth is in its final meaning, but not in the SAME MEANING—form of Jesus—as they and some of us have believed. Belief is not all that is required, since, understanding

has changed the belief which might have been held as to what the jury believed against the prisoner. You ask why your belief will not come true as to "the second coming" of Jesus in the form of "the Christ", and I reply, "because your belief is the result of a selfish thought," which, of course, is derived from Nature, since, only an unselfish Thought can be associated with the Spiritual, or that which is Eternal as Truth is Eternal. In other words, you look for a person—"a sign when no sign shall come"—and a person or yourself to be benefited by the same, Yet, your belief has had much to do with the Truth, or second coming, in that it seems to require about so much of self or nature, because of a selfish generation to aid the Truth as Paul said "MY LIE" is a help to Truth. Your surprise will be and is that the second coming is the same Truth Jesus taught is for ALL to "overcome the world" as Jesus did and Paul made reference to it when he said "I wish all men were even as I myself." "The son of man cometh not by observation" or, "the kingdom of God cometh not by observation". My definition of the word "Kingdom" is Spirit. So, "the son of man" is but the Truth concerning man, which is the Spirit in Truth concerning man, for you could not connect these two passages in any other way, since both "come not by observation"—in the form of man. But both man and spirit are one and the same in meaning, because the spirit cannot be seen unless in the form of man, therefore, "The Son", because "The Spirit", or "The Spirit", because "The Son". But you have "looked for a sign", when it is only the Truth in a different form than what you had

118 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

believed, yet, the same Truth, but not the SAME SIGN—form called Jesus Christ.

Now, if we would consider more that which builds up a character for man, instead of looking for such a character in man, or that he ought to be so and so irrespective of how he should go about to obtain such an end, we might realize some change for the better. But we condemn each other; looking at a character no worse than our own, and also excuse ourselves with the idea that we are all "BORN IN SIN", thereby making little, if any chance for improvement along the line of reformation. But a law which is framed with Progress will not be forever hindered, nor outgrown, for it is ever a growth. It seems there is a class of persons who build up, and another which destroys. One says "I am going to MAKE the most out of life", while the other says "I am going to GET the most out of life". The former is a builder, and the latter is a destroyer. Now the fault lies in the fact that man has been unable to grasp the true definition of himself, because he looked too much at what is created in the Physical or Animal alone, rather than to the Thought or Mental as the Cause which either builds or destroys the character of man, and then builds or destroys the body also. We read books and books on "Physical Culture", and see as a result of this, a "parade" of "fools" as Emerson would say, half naked and running on the main thoroughfares. It is a "display" of the Physical, but shows a weakness of the Mental. This might have been practical years ago, but the Physical is on its "last legs" in trying to impress the world that it still holds a great prestige, for,

the age of Mentality is fast outdoing it, in that it is the greatest power with the least exertion. A true Metaphysician watching the growth of the Mental, cannot escape the fact that the Physical is fast losing its significance. He is above his fellow physical, in that it is not a wonder to him that man is continually losing his physical power—the muscles, since he is growing less out of the need of them. It does not seem a miracle to him that the pyramids of Egypt cannot be moved to-day by a machine, since the machine has not developed that power as yet, nor that it was impossible for man to place them there by physical means, because they were stronger physically than we are physically and mentally so. It is only because we are getting weaker physically, that the machine invented is so powerful seemingly, and it is because we are getting weaker physically that it is necessary for the growth of the machine which is the result of Mental growth. Neither does this signify that we are weaker, but really is significant of greater power, since the Mental will replace the physical with greater strength as we look to it more than we do to the physical. Space does not permit here to go into details along the lines of the Physical and Mental Philosophy, but a hint is here given to suffice that it so exists, and may well be given time and study.

So, man has considered himself or form something in reality, when it is nothing, ("Ye are as sheep for the slaughter"), for, if he sails with integrity, he becomes upright, and to sail with impurity is to become impure. He looks for himself in a mirror to find there only a shadow of a doubt,

because he has not found there that which is real. He believes in himself because he sees something there that looks real, when in reality it is only a shadow of what ought to be real. He has also traversed the whole of consciousness to find it empty, because he expected to find something there which resembled himself. If he had looked within the veil of understanding, he would have FORMED therein a Soul or Sense of Thought which is the builder of man, but NOT THE MAN, or HIMSELF, yet, himself by justification, because the Thought is ever the "Father" to the fact or *vice versa*. It is not that we shall spend our time in idle dreams, and then expect to awake to glorified Being, or a something we have had no part in building. If we stand in the path of Progress, we become stagnant, because we are playing with stagnation. You might say, "what have I to do with Progress?" and I reply, "very little or very much in the nature of an animal". It only concerns me a little when I am small, and concerns me much when I am great; but I cannot become great unless I recognize and put into practice what is capable of making me such, and cannot be small unless I recognize what has made me such but it is because I am small that I have not recognized Progress in its True Form, since, we cannot be small or empty if we know the Truth, and Progress is Truth. So, Progress is a Universal Law working and Truth is Universal, yet, neither are Universally used as such. There are a class of persons who do not believe in liberty in all things, and such cannot Progress, because they are in Error and false. To oppose liberty means bondage, and to bind one to

a given thing whether it be a fact or no, is to stop Progress and therefore hinder Truth. Mr. Ingersoll gives a good illustration of Progress in his talk on "The Ghosts". He says, "Montaigne, a man blest with so much common sense that he was the most uncommon man of his time, was the first to raise a voice against torture in France. But what was the voice of one man against the terrible cry of ignorant, infatuated, superstitious and malevolent millions? It was the cry of a drowning man in the wild roar of a cruel sea. In spite of the efforts of the brave few, the infamous war against the freedom of the Soul was waged until at last one hundred millions of human beings—fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters—with hopes, loves, and aspirations like ourselves, were sacrificed upon the cruel altar of an ignorant faith. Every nerve of pain was sought out and touched by the belief in Ghosts.

"For my part I glory in the fact, that here in the new world—in the United States—the liberty of conscience was first guaranteed to man, and that the constitution of the United States was the first great decree entered in the high court of human equity forever divorcing Church and State—the first injunction granted against the interference of the Ghosts. This was one of the grandest steps ever taken by the human race in the direction of Progress.

"You will ask what has caused this wonderful change in three hundred years. And I answer—the inventions and discoveries of the few,—the brave thoughts, the heroic utterances of the few;—the acquisition of a few facts.

"You must remember that every wrong in some way tends to abolish itself. It is hard to make a lie stand always. A lie will not fit a fact. It will only fit another lie made for the purpose. The life of a lie is simply a question of time. Nothing but Truth is immortal."

When I look about me and see men who have never given a hand toward Progress and Truth in anything, I think how fortunate for such that there are progressive persons with inventive ideas—thoughts. These persons do not seem to realize the fact that their happiness is due to the few, and would even scorn if you hinted to them it is a fact, for they too believe they have had a share in making Progress.

I said to a friend recently that the time is coming when there will be no cemeteries, because the work of cremation shall be the universal method in the disposition of the dead. He replied: "What an insane idea." But he is one of those who looks only to nature and present methods already formed by usage, and if told before electricity came into use, that such would be possible some day; would have said, what an insane idea. Here again, I might turn from the direct subject, yet, it is a part of the subject in explanation, since Cremation is a form of Knowledge and understanding, and will be more so in the day of increased judgment. With all the floral displays and monumental architecture, the cemetery is not in line with Progress, nor is it conducive to happiness and civilization, but is looked and made a part of civilization thru PAST CUSTOM. It is really but a remembrance of that which should not be remembered, since it does not

contribute anything towards happiness, nor a relief from pain, but is ever the source of one kind of pain and unhappiness. But some persons are never happy unless they are in pain, or suffer, because they "believe" some such things are "sent from God", and so necessary and right to suffer. If it were not for what some one would say and think if we did not pay such tribute to the dead, there would even now be much less following to the cemetery. We do so much for custom and formality sake, that we forget what is, or overlook what is reasonable, and thereby hinder Progress in another form. I agree that many persons would have to look elsewhere for employment and other business, if the cemetery was abolished, but this is characteristic of all changes being made along the line of Reformation and Progress. I believe too, that there are many in the business for the money and business end of it, and not because they believe in its more proper disposition of the dead. The word "Sanitary" which is really a farce today in most cases, is used to represent health conditions, and I should think it ought to be used in connection with the disposition of the dead, as in all animal and decayed matter. Granting that you are greater than "many sparrows" when the body manifests life, you are no more than many sparrows when the body is in a state of decay. I rather have those of my friends remember me when alive to the fact that I may appreciate it, and so do not care to be seen or remembered when I cannot appreciate it, since the body is nothing to be admired while in a state subject to decay. The last time I care to see any one, or to remember them is when

124 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

I see them moving as a body, for it is only then that I can care for, or do anything to assist them. I believe so much in the life of man, and nothing in a dead body that I trust my body shall be given to some hospital for any purpose they may see fit, if I do not leave behind me the necessary funds for Cremation. So then, we should not be expected to associate with dead things, or things unlike ourselves. It would be just as well and reasonable for you and your friends to be left so, since those alive are only harboring something which will not make them happy, and certainly of no help to those gone, because you are on an entirely different plane of existence. I know this idea will be repulsive to some, yet, these very same persons and friends who are now repulsed by this remark, will gossip and quarrel and even in some cases make life miserable for their friend and folk now, and then try and pay tribute, or give in return a few tears and flowers and a burial when they pass away.

You, who will feel repulsed by the above idea, which may seem too radical, cannot be more repulsed than those who heard the same thing nearly two thousand years ago, nor should you be so if you believe in Jesus Christ. When Jesus was teaching the Truth as it should be lived: "The disciples said to him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," and Jesus said, "follow me and let the dead bury the dead". While this refers to "the dead" idea of what LIFE IS and has been preached to us, as life, it also proves there is nothing gained in spending time with the dead body, since it cannot reveal any knowledge, nor impart a growth to man in the way of what builds up. I have failed to

see where sighing and mourning over "SPILLED MILK" has brought any good result, or happiness to those who sigh and mourn. I know when my father and mother passed away I could not sigh nor mourn their loss because I knew they were then out from under the bond of sickness and a condition they could not be relieved from, in order to enjoy life, and so, really felt a RELIEF FOR THEM, and by so doing, was relieved myself from the effects of sighing and mourning. Let us therefore remember to HELP NOW "the widows and orphans". This sympathetic sense is generally derived from nature, or is characteristic of the animal, which I shall aim to prove a little farther on in the work is nothing but selfishness—the feeling not being so much to protect for protection's sake, as it is to satisfy self, or that it—the young or children BELONG TO ME. To say to the hungry man, "I feel sorry for you", and so sympathize with him WILL NEVER FEED and RELIEVE HIS HUNGER.

Religion has ever been a part to hinder Progress. It does not appear to us to-day, or to me at least, when you and I look back at the damnable atrocities perpetrated thru a religious belief that men had a clear conscience as to right and wrong. They were murderers, therefore their God was a murderer, as it says regarding such,—“they believe they do God service”. Martin Luther had a clearer and better Conscience, or was Conscious of a better God—Thought than others of his time, therefore “The Reformation”. It was a grand revival when he said, “let the scriptures be put in the hands of everybody; let every one interpret them

for himself, according to the light he has; let there be private judgment—let spiritual liberty be revived, as in Apostolic days. When the priests said, concerning the scriptures. “We, the priests will keep it out of their hands. They will get notions from it fatal to OUR AUTHORITY; they will become fanatics,—they will in their conceit defy us;” “Thus Luther rose more powerful, more eloquent, more majestic than before: he arose superior to himself.” What, said he, “keep the light of life from the people;” take away their guide to heaven; keep them in ignorance of what is most precious and most exalting; deprive them of the blessed consolation which sustain the soul in trial and in death; deny the most palpable truths because your dignitaries put on them a construction to bolster up their power! What an abomination! what treachery to heaven! what perils to the soul of man! Besides, your authorities differ. Augustine takes different ground from Pelagius: Bernard from Avelard: Thomas Aquinas from Dun Scotus. Have not your grand councils given contradictory decisions? whom shall ye believe? Yea, the popes themselves, your infallible guides—have they not at different times rendered different decisions? What would Gregory I. say to the verdicts of Gregory VII.?”

“About the time the Pope was in need of money: this was Leo X. He not only squandered his vast revenues in pleasures and pomps, like any secular monarch; he not only collected pictures and statues,—but he wanted to complete St. Peter’s Church. It was the crowning glory of papal magnificence. Where was he to get the money except from the

contributions of Christendom? But kings and princes and bishops and abbots were getting tired of his everlasting drain of money to Rome." (Here I might mention the fact,—only one case—that a certain priest carried something like sixty thousand dollars to the Pope in Rome from the hard earnings of the followers of the Church in this United States) "in the shape of annats and taxes,—so Leo revived an old custom of the Dark Ages,—he would sell indulgences for sin; and he sent his agents to peddle them in every country. The agent in Saxony was a very vulgar, boisterous, noisy, bullying Dominican, by the name of Tetzel. Luther abhorred him, not so much so because he was vulgar and noisy, but because his infamous business derogated from the majesty of God and religion. In wrathful indignation he preached against Tetzel and his practices,—the abominable traffic of indulgences. Only God can forgive sins. It seemed to him to be an insult to the human understanding that any man, even a pope, should grant an absolution for crime. These indulgences were the very worst form of penance, since they made a mockery of virtue. The people who bought, the agents who sold, the popes who dispensed, these indulgences, used them for the vilest purposes."

We can hardly be expected to join in and follow such a Religion that has grown from such a root. I am not saying but what there are good qualities in all creeds, or but what most of them to-day are upholding with sincerity what they believe is religious. But a Religion that is void of Reason according to experience and observation of things as they present themselves to a more scientific and progressive

age cannot expect to live and thrive forever. Although Galileo, Copernicus and many other known Philosophers "inaugurated the era which lead to progressive improvements in the physical conditions of society", and made wonderful astronomical discoveries, they were tortured and cruelly dealt with by the Church. But they were able to prove what they knew and thought, and their Knowledge and works have lived, while the religious views have and are changing,—and it is because of the religious view making a change, that their works and ideas as well as others are more universally believed. So, "Creed", or the different Religions, in my estimation, means separation from a fact, since they express more that one idea by the very name creed—which is impossible to be so in the Science of an established Principle. So let us have "the doctrine" of Truth, for Truth in any form is not, nor cannot be controled by a Creed. When you have more than one Church or Society, etc., standing for the Truth, then it is a DIVISION of the Truth, and consequently cannot be the Whole Truth in either, by that Creed and division. Jesus was compelled to talk outside of the Church because he taught NO CREED. "The multitudes" illustrates no Creed, because it is significant of one life. Because I do not belong to any Church, (Immanuel Kant, the great writer on Metaphysics would not even attend a Church), I am free to do and think as I please, since the signing your name to a Creed and the like Society, binds you to certain other things from what you may think, because all have their rules and by-laws framed generally by others, or the one at the head of it. So I feel more inde-

pendent and better able to support my own ideas, than to support those of others, and am not only free to do so, but am not bound to support a thing that generally reaps a benefit for a few, or one at the head of it. When talking with a friend on this subject of belief, he asked, "Do you not believe others as well as you, are correct in some of their views?" I replied, "I believe there are people who are correct in some of their views; but when I think they are correct, then, that is my view and belief also." But for me to agree in all of their views, is for me to give up my views. If I did not think I am correct in ALL of my views, then, I need not write, since I would and could only write of some one else. If Jesus had agreed with the views of others and the Church as to Truth as he actually knew it—knew it because he proved it so as I have proved it so, he could not have told the Truth, neither would he have been ridiculed and put to death as all who have "talked before their time" have experienced such in times when people were governed by the Church, or had power to say whether a man should live or not. Jesus lived the Spiritual life in the flesh, and his disciples were "sent by him" because taught by him, and not that they were any better morally than others. It is said "they are made perfect in one", because they taught the gospel in the same way as he—Jesus taught them, but not that all lived the same Truth as he lived it, since the married could not, nor cannot do so, or live as he lived, and for this reason they were "SCATTERED", after the death of Jesus. Neither could Jesus have lived the Spiritual life if he had not given the whole of

130 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

"his life" up to the teaching and preaching of it, and because he was born under the Spiritual environment and of a mother who also gave much to the Spiritual unlifting of man, so he became likewise. It required **CONSTANT PRESENCE** of the Thought—God Consciousness after "the fast" in order to abstain from natural indulgence in the way of the sexual. People continue to ask in the name of Pilate, "What is Truth?" The disciples could not adhere to the Truth he taught, and so returned as he said they would to "**THEIR OWN**", because they were married, yet, they gave out the words, and as words live, so the Truth shall live. Jesus "washed us from our sins in his own blood"—life—that is, he gave up his life—the natural or sexual indulgence or the double life so termed—Evil and Good—for the one—Good or God life, called Spiritual, that thru its knowledge and understanding, man, could in time be able to come out from under the bond of what is termed sin—that which is natural—so that which is Spiritual can manifest itself more universally so. The remark made by Jesus that "ye cannot serve two masters", signifies you cannot have **ONLY ONE** in the Conscience and "serve it" continually, while both Good and Evil are preached to you as it is to-day. In other words, it is not necessary to preach Evil, in order to destroy it; in fact, you cannot destroy a thing until you fail to recognize it. Preaching Good and Evil is typified by a gathering of men and women. The conversation may have opened on a good subject, but soon, one of the party opens the conversation with an evil subject, and all fall into the net. If they had known

only the one, or had only Good preached to them, they could talk of nothing else. If you gave a scholar the subject of Geography continually, it stands to Reason and Judgment and Understanding, that it would know nothing of Arithmetic. This reminds me of something on the same principle. Prohibition in Kansas has been so long in duration, that the generation now growing up—the children do not see liquor and therefore cannot crave nor have an appetite for it. So we have Prohibition because we talk it more than the Liquor party talks liquor. Each one reaps his own. We have liquor because we preach it, demand it, and advertise it, and so it is with anything that lives—it only lives by recognition. To-day we have the understanding and therefore the Judgment that the Natural is against the Spiritual—"the flesh lusteth against the spirit"—because all destructive and diseased conditions are the result of the Natural or belong to the Natural. Thru this understanding and judgment, we receive the Knowledge that the Spiritual life TO BE, is the life to be lived here, and so is—that is—the true understanding is the "Second Coming of Christ". In all these years of preaching to man that he should overcome sin, we have at the same time implied that he was "born in sin", and therefore, try to destroy a quality he was born under—a very serious proposition I declare. But we have observed if a man lives under certain evils and conditions contrary to that which produces a more Perfect growth, that such cannot live in peace and harmony, even though he is not in sin. It is reasonable to believe then, that such a man cannot live forever, or hereafter, since he has

132 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

not, nor CANNOT live wholly according to a given Rule that is Eternal. The same candle (body or form) does not exist forever, but the light still exists by another candle of the same making, yet, not the same light by expression of the candle is it greatest, since Time creates or develops another and more perfect light as shown in the electric. But this light or spirit of the candle to-day, is expressed by other candles when that candle is burned out, just as the OLD BELIEF is expressed to-day by some people when that life is out. A piece of coal expresses heat, but the piece of coal that did express heat, has been replaced by another piece of coal because the former piece had the heat and light burned out of it,—yet, the same heat—life and light, but not the same piece of coal. The piece of coal is an auxiliary to heat at present, as Matter is an auxiliary to Thought at present, since the Material means are necessary until the Spiritual or Thought becomes Absolute, or “first that which is Natural afterward that which is Spiritual”. While Satan is derived thru the Material, it is not of the Material, any more than God is of the Material, but is Thought, and thru this Material seen as Thought does it receive its name Natural, and so God as Thought derives its Cause thru the Material also, but is not of the Material either, but, and because and thru the destructive principle of the Natural as Temporal as Thought, is God seen and known as Eternal Thought. The belief that man dies in order to become Spiritual hinders “the word of God”, because the Word can never be Realized as that of Perfection in the form of man, unless demonstrated so in the Visible life of man,

as it is illustrated so in the remark made by John,—"The word was made flesh and dwelt among us", which does not necessarily refer to Jesus, other than that the Word could not be distinguished only by form. Do you imagine a Perfect building could arise from a pile of stone without the aid of help? Man could not rise to Perfection from imperfection without aid. How then can death put on life? neither could life put on death and then put on life again. Life is never extinct in any form. The Principle of Thought is perfect in a Sense, yet if it had nothing to work upon which is the shape of man, or you,—it could no more produce a perfect form of Completeness, or become so as Visible, than the plan of a building could be Perfectly constructed without the aid of material.

In Revelation 20:6, we read,—“Blessed and holy IS he that hath part in the first resurrection,—on such the second death hath no power.” The end of the Natural condition, or propagation period, is the death referred to here, which is “the end of the world”, instead of the general belief that the world is to be destroyed. Now, it stands to reason in my opinion that at the end of the propagation period, there shall be no death, since death can only exist so long as propagation exists, for, if there is nothing breeding, there is nothing dying. The opinion of Mrs. Eddy is that this “death” refers to you and I “LATER”, but I claim it can allude only to Nature and man in “the latter days”. She says in substance, that “I may die now—pass away—but thru my claiming or demonstrating NOW, or before death, that I—“man is Spiritual and not material”,—and though I die now, I will not die

but overcome later what here is called "the second death". HERE and NOW is the fact that death—the natural condition of life is to be overcome, and then is "the second death". If this referred to man or you specifically, how could the term "second", here be used? Since, SECOND DEATH signifies that which HAS taken place, and not that it is GOING to take place with YOU hereafter, or later, but WILL TAKE PLACE WITH THINGS THAT EXIST later. It does not read "over such", DEATH hath no power, but that the SECOND DEATH "hath no power", therefore, referring to the Natural condition which is destroyed, and "HATH NO POWER" BECAUSE IT IS DESTROYED, since life in all forms of life hath power so long as it exists. So I repeat and interpret again in this way,—“Blessed is he that hath part in the first resurrection”—SOME, or "part" of the first Knowledge of the Truth concerning the Spiritual Thought of life to be lived HERE, which Truth has been and is the FIRST DEATH because not understood. And "on such" or God known because it is Eternal life, "the second death" or Satan known because it is Temporal life "hath no power" because its power is ended in the "Second death". Meaning the Natural is to be abolished or destroyed, and consequently, "THE SECOND DEATH", while a misunderstanding must be the FIRST DEATH, though it mentions none. Nevertheless, we read in Rev. 1: 18, "I am he that liveth and was dead,"—not understood, therefore the FIRST DEATH. It is absurd to connect what she calls death, or what we call death with what I call the first death, because

the death of a thing is the end of that thing, but not the end or death of Thought Eternal. The candle is but the name of the form of light given by the candle, and man is but the name of the form of Spirit or Thought given by the man. Paul's remark illustrates this, for he said,—“When this mortal shall have put on immortality,—death shall be swallowed up in victory.” Paul could not put on the entire State of Immortality in its FINAL Spiritual form, nor did he say so, just because it reads “this mortal”, which same is to signify a later period than the time in which Paul lived, or, “WHEN”. It refers to ALL MORTALITY being outlived, or the end of such a condition, and that there is no other place than here where “this mortal can put on immortality”. Neither do I claim because it says “when this mortal shall have put on immortality, that the mortal can put on immortality, since, flesh is flesh, and cannot “put on”, nor even turn to anything unlike its own. This term is but to illustrate that the mortal shall be REPLACED by the immortal condition, “WHEN” the Thought is wholly existing as a Spiritual body instead of the present mortal body thru its work on the mortal—the mortal existing so long as mortality subsists on mortality—one thing thrives on another so long as propagation exists. That is, mortals, in all forms of life organic, subsists on mortality, or flesh, so to speak, in order to exist as mortality. In one sense, a term applied to eternal life—mortality is eternal as by a growth it continues to exist or works to its own end, when it is no more eternal when that end is reached. But man, will in time, thru Thought—God—be able to

overcome the mortal, when it destroys in him the Natural, until finally—at “the end of the world”—mortality, all Nature requiring food for its existence shall be destroyed, for the Thought as God and Man will then exist as it IS Spiritual,—in the form of a Spiritual body. The Thought will eventually destroy all desire of the flesh, and the organs which constitute and create desire—nature, so there can be no desire for the Natural, and the Spiritual so termed can then exist without the so termed Natural. To say—according to Mrs. Eddy and Mental Scientists, that “there is no matter”, or “it is only a belief”, and that disease and the like are directly due to “man made laws”, is too absurd for consideration. Jesus said, “I can of myself do nothing” because man and all animal life in organic form is subject to diseased conditions so long as the Natural condition of organic life and the propagation period exists. But because the diseased conditions are due to the Natural condition only, you aid in destroying the same by overcoming as much as possible the cause of such conditions by affirming the Truth of and Eternal Thought of life known as the Spiritual, or to be known as the Spiritual. Of course, disease is a “man made law”, as man—the mortal exists under the Natural law of disease and death, and because of a Conscience he **MUST MAKE THE LAWS ACCORDINGLY**, or he must make the laws which are made only according to the conditions that exist. But not that he is necessarily the **INDIVIDUAL AUTHOR** of the conditions or laws that exist, because these existed **LONG BEFORE MAN EXISTED**, since, **man** was the last formation. He is, according to

my understanding told that the time is coming when man can overcome these conditions—that is, the Higher Thought overcomes them and carries man with it, but to claim he is the Cause or Origin of these conditions, or makes the laws individually and independently, (the form or building can make no laws), and THEN TELL HIM TO “OVERCOME THEM”, is too absurd for consideration. Jesus would not have said you should “overcome the world” if man made the laws, or, if God were and is responsible for Creation, since THIS COMMAND CONTRADICTS such an idea, for, there would be no sense in trying to “overcome” a thing that man and God made, because YOU CANNOT PLACE A THING ABOVE, or SUPERIOR TO ITS OWN. So I term organic life in the term or form of Creation and propagation or animal life, which CANNOT RISE HIGHER THAN ITS OWN, as the primitive man exists according to nature, and if it were not for the Higher Thought or God, the primitive man would still be a primitive man or no higher than the animal. So, the material and diseased conditions will exist so long as the Natural conditions or Evil exists. I say, Natural Evil, because, even though it is according to Nature, or propagation is Natural, yet, “the flesh lusteth against the Spirit”—Nature is against the Spirit or Mental. But we are not condemned hereafter (no hereafter) for what we, or man is unable to avoid under existing conditions, because we are what these conditions are HERE and NOW. But by destroying the Natural Condition, you as God will aid, have “part” some knowledge of how these conditions shall be destroyed, which finally ends,

because it is really THE DEATH referred to, and man also during that condition or existence. Allow me to repeat that "the second death" refers to the Natural condition and propagation period, by repeating the eighteenth verse and first chapter of Revelation. "I am he that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive forever more, amen; and have the keys of hell and death." As said before,—there being no mention of a FIRST DEATH in any of the chapters, yet, a "second death", it here simply explains to me that THERE IS NONE, nor could there have been an actual death for God—the Spiritual Thought,—therefore, no real object for mentioning a first death, yet, a misunderstanding of the Truth in its actuality is a FIRST DEATH to the Truth, which same gives an excuse for mentioning of a "second death", and the fact that the Truth or Good cannot accomplish any Good over that which is Error or Evil, if the latter is upheld as the Truth, or as much as the Truth, and so the term "second death" is used as an application to the Natural condition. "I am he that liveth and was dead"—liveth as a Principle not developed, so dead, but now, or when a better understanding is discernible or visible—"the veil is taken away"—"I am alive forever more". "The keys of hell and death" we should realize NOW from our understanding or judgment, are these Truths, for they—the Truths of life are the "keys", since they will destroy the Evils which always end in hell for man NOW, and as long as they exist. Truth IS hell to Error, and necessarily will be "THE END" of it, though Religion in the name of Christianity would tell us God is a Being or

Person who sends man to Hell because HE IS IGNORANT, or seems to work contrary to a law HE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND, neither is he responsible for its origin. Evil, or Satan will send a man to hell quick enough, because it IS hell now—a diseased brain and body—and not that God or Good can send man to hell, since, a Thought that is Good will destroy a Thought that is Evil, and therefore bring about a healthy condition. Paul said, "Our citizenship IS in heaven", and our citizenship IS in hell, in the sense that the former refers to a Good condition and the latter to an Evil condition of Conscious Thought. "IS", meaning a PRESENT STATE, while the general religious view of WILL BE refers to a FUTURE STATE of you and I as man. You cannot go BEYOND YOUR PRESENT STATE, because a Conscience cannot exist without a brain and body, which is no Conscience and body of you when the brain and body is extinguished, but continues as other bodies, therefore, you cannot be subject to anything beyond your present condition, because there is no beyond, until the beyond or hereafter is reached, and THEN IT IS HERE AND NOW when the beyond or hereafter is reached.

Jesus said, "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom." As stated before, my definition of the word Kingdom is Spirit, and it applies scientifically in every case where the word kingdom is used. Let us here dwell on the word, and I can convince you perhaps that "the Kingdom of God" is having "the Spirit of God, and is not a locality, nor an abiding place, or space sep-

140 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

arate from another, but is a state of Consciousness separate from another state of Consciousness, or, that the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of Satan is but the Spirit of either." I will quote the following passages from the New Testament spoken by Jesus, and therefore more authentic than those written in the Old Testament, or those spoken even by Paul and others.

"And when he was demanded by the Pharisees, when the Kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the Kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17: 20-21). The Pharisees, like the ignorant people, or Pharisees to-day, who "LOOK FOR A SIGN", or looked to see it,—“Lo here; or lo there”—demanded to know WHEN the kingdom of God should be, or when shall God take hold and make his kingdom appear, or be present; but we find “the kingdom of God cometh not with observation”, for the spirit—“kingdom of God is within you”, IF IT BE SO THAT “the spirit of God dwelleth in you”, instead of the spirit of Satan. Nor is the Spirit OF God, but it IS God. This word “OF” has formed the opinion of a God, because it says OF God. But, the Spirit IS God, just as Thought IS God, or God IS Thought. The words, Spirit, Thought, God, and Kingdom are synonyms used at different times to express the same meaning to avoid repetition in a verse. It says in Matthew 6: 10, in connection with prayer, “Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it IS in heaven”. (i.e.) The Spirit to do Good “will be done” according to

the will as it develops Higher, which is to say the Truth shall be universally lived according to the Heaven—Highest conception of life, and not according to the Earth—Lowest conception or Natural life, yet, “IN THE EARTH”—world as it exists. It says, “For nation shall rise against nation, and Kingdom against Kingdom”, that is, one country shall fight another country in the form of Good and Evil, or “Kingdom against Kingdom,—Spirit against Spirit—God against Satan. “But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then is the Kingdom of God come unto you”. The word Kingdom is used here in the sentence so as to avoid the repetition of the word Spirit. So, if I—the Spirit—Good, cast out devils—evil spirits, by the Spirit that is Good—then this Spirit or Kingdom—God is come unto you—you are Conscious of it, because the Spirit—Kingdom—Evil—Satan is “cast out”. “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God” (John 3:3-5). These quotations from John would indicate by the word “see” and “enter” if taken metaphorically, that there is to be, or will be a locality, to behold and enter, but we have SEEN that it is not a Spirit or Kingdom to BEHOLD, other than to SEE IT, or to BEHOLD IT as PRESENT IN the Conscience, since, it “COMETH NOT WITH OBSERVATION” but is “WITHIN YOU”. Here, the word “see” signifies that man cannot recognize or see and live the Spirit unless he is “born again”, since, he lives under the opposite state of Con-

142 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

sciousness when not born into the other, and of course, "cannot see" because blinded by the other. "Ye have eyes and see not", because you are blinded by the false idea of eternal life, or that which IS Eternal life. "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be?" "Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" (John 3:9-10). Nicodemus was at the head of the Church, but he could not understand, as the heads of the Church to-day, how man must be "born again", because they always look on the Physical side of life for man, here, and the Spiritual side of life for man hereafter, when BOTH are to be lived HERE. When you replace the word Spirit with that of Mental, or the word Spirituality with that of Mentality, you will find that the Mental life is the Spiritual life, or that it is the Mental which shall overcome the Physical, and that to be born again can only refer to the Mental, since, man cannot as Nicodemus cites: "enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born again". So, he cannot "enter" into the Kingdom or Spirit of God, unless he is "born of water and of the Spirit", which is to say the "water" signifies the LIFE of the Spirit, because the Spirit is Life, and he enters into that water of Life when he has the same which makes the Oneness of Both. Besides; if he must be "born again" only to "SEE" the Kingdom of God, there would be no rest OUTSIDE of such a Kingdom. "The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither to come here to draw", which is the Life or Water no man need thirst after. Jesus asked all to partake of this

Water—Life freely, for it is the “Water of Life”, or Life of Life that IS Spiritual, and not WILL BE Spiritual, and not the water of life that is Natural. Again: “Jesus answered, my Kingdom is not of this world.” (i.e.) The Spirit—God is not of, or this world—the Natural, because it is not Natural, yet it is in the world, but is not of “this world” which is Temporal. In Revelation it says, “Now is come salvation, and strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ; the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.” In other words, the generation—this age has reached the Scientific period wherein the Truth will not continue to be shaken by Error, but has reached the height of Consciousness wherein it has “cast down” the “accuser of our brethren”—which accuser is the Natural or Error of Life, while the one to “cast down” this Error is the Christ Idea having reached its Power thru the understanding that it is the only Kingdom—Spirit of God—Thought that can live forever. Nothing but Thought can work “day and night”, therefore the Spirit—Thought of Error or Evil is that which has accused the Spirit—Thought of Truth and Good and man who embodies them. It is said to “Suffer not little children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of heaven”. Not that children are or will be the inhabitants of a place called heaven, but not having reached that state of Consciousness and maturity wherein the Sense of sexual indulgence is; therefore the Spirit of God, is the Spirit —“Kingdom of heaven” expressed by them, since, Truly, the Spirit or Kingdom of heaven “IS

144 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

WITHIN " them. The above passage illustrates this and nothing more; the children being used only to signify the Highest—Heaven State of Consciousness because of the Natural not having developed there, since, it could not exist in the child, until the child had matured. My definition of "heaven" being the Highest conception of Life, and "earth" the Lowest conception of Life, so "little children" are of the "Kingdom of Heaven"—Spirit of the Highest conception of Life.

Turning back to "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his Kingdom"; it is reasonable to believe now that "to taste of death", we must recognize the New—Christ Idea of Life, or "see the son of man"—embodied form of Truth in the form of man which will destroy the Old—Adam Idea, which latter will be the "taste of death" referred to. It is as much as to say that in no generation can one "taste of death" until the Old Idea had been destroyed. Jesus referred to this dual Life, and Death of one—taste of death, when he said, "I lay down my life, that I may take it up again". Of course, the general belief is that this passage refers to some of them he addressed, or to the people in general; that they would live on even after death and then have "renewed" life. But we can see with much more reason how one in any age can lose an old belief—taste of death—when they take on an opposite condition or belief. Jesus said: "But I say unto you, that every idle word that man shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." You will note it does not say, "that every idle word YOU speak,

YOU shall give account of in the day of judgment", but that it is the work of Thought in "man" and in all "men" as man and men or "they", and not necessarily in or of YOU as a responsible individual to suffer. The Truth and Error works thru men, and because of this, "they", certainly, must give account for in the day of judgment, or when the day of understanding is reached when they—the works of Evil shall be destroyed as fast as Good can destroy them, and man also for that matter, since he is the embodiment of these. So too, shall the idle words YOU speak to-day will have to be given account of by man later, since, what you speak are those—"they" who follow you are subject to, or inherit what you speak, until that "idle talk" is gradually overcome by the Higher Sense of life and man.

If we all had an invitation to go to heaven to-night (no such place) there is not one who would accept it, and yet, YOU PREACH THERE IS A HEAVEN, and say, IT IS THE ETERNAL PLACE OF HAPPINESS AND REST, and CONTRADICT THIS ASSERTION by taking medicine and the like, to KEEP FROM GOING THERE—what silly rot. Besides, it would be too monotonous, since, even pleasure here becomes a monotony, and, while you may think it would be such a different pleasure along a different channel and for a Being called God, and that it would not become monotonous, it stands to reason that such an existence could not be possible. To accept heaven and hell as localities, other than a locality existing as a condition of life throughout the ages is very absurd. It is true that many have suffered

untold agonies because of such a belief, but this does not necessarily make heaven a fact. It is said, "The martyrs cheerfully and heroically endured physical sufferings in view of the glorious crown of which they were assured in the future world". But, when Christianity became more powerful, we find many who did not believe as these SO-CALLED Christians,—("Christian", is only a name used to designate an opposite belief, of which I shall prove later amounts to nothing AS A NAME) that THEY, TOO, SUFFERED UNTOLD AGONIES", at the hands of Christians, and it is even so to-day in some countries. Does this not throw BOTH IN THE SAME BALANCE? It was only a matter of who thought they were right, whether they were right or no, and the most powerful of the two caused the other to suffer. It was not so much so because they were Christians, (they had the same brutal nature in them) that they had to suffer, but because they held to their rights, that is,—each one tried to uphold what they believed were their rights. It did not necessarily make either right because they suffered,—but because they thought they were right, they fought and suffered for their rights. Here again, as in all cases, I wish to impress the reader with the fact that it is Good and Evil in whatever form it is, that is WORKING, and not man, yet, man works because governed by these. It seems that there must always be rivalry, in order to bring about certain things as a natural sequence or following. It was and is a matter of if you do not follow my belief, you must suffer for it, though all may be wrong, as Emerson says, "Good and bad

are names very readily transferable to that or this". But, "wisdom shall be justified of her children", for, Reason shall in time condemn no man to suffer for another's belief, which is partially showing itself to-day in the liberty of belief and Thought. Now, let us Reason this thing a little in another way than what is ordinarily used as an illustration to point out heaven and hell. We have a man who has all the necessities of life—wealth, health, etc. He believes there is a future heaven for him, and he has a right to believe such, because it is preached to him, and he cannot see or believe otherwise. This places him in a good position **HERE** and **HEREAFTER**. Now we have a man who has poor health, and barely an existence in the necessities of life. He believes there is a future heaven for him, and he has a right to believe such, because it is preached to him, and he cannot see or believe otherwise. This places him in a good position **ONLY IN THE HEREAFTER**. Now I ask in the name of **REASON**, can such a conclusion as a heaven or a life hereafter be drawn from such an argument? It is clearly seen by this, or should be seen by the above that there is no such a Person or Being as God, but that such is a condition of life, expressive by man, since a God, nor even a Reasonable man would not throw the burden and hardships upon one person called ignorant and poor. Therefore, these conditions of rich and poor, health and disease, wise and ignorant are the result of certain opportunities, environments, and circumstances—the hereditary and associations during one's life are the **CAUSE** of this and that. The change of these like opportunities, etc., are to be

148 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

made when the Christ Idea of a life on a more equal basis shall be reached, instead of the present master and servant idea which has been formed from the educational plan of a few as Master, as taught by these few that God is master and man is servant,—giving no opportunity for all to educate themselves on a more equal basis. It is said by the MORE ADVANCED PREACHERS in the Church to-day that “there is no hell or eternal punishment for man”, but that, “there is a heaven for man”,—changing the former “belief” of hell. Then I claim it is just as Reasonable to argue that there is no heaven for man. There is just as much Sense in changing the latter, as the former. You must change the other if you change the one. If you have preached and do preach one place as the result of living good, then you must preach the other place as the result of living evil, else, BOTH must wind up in the same place. But, people are not always good, neither are they always evil,—nor are there any who are good all the time, and those who are bad all the time,—so it would be, and IS impossible to make any distinction, or that one class shall go to heaven, and that another class shall “go to hell”. What you think is good form, may be an evil form to me, and what you think is Evil may seem good to me, but ALL must SUFFER and ENJOY, and HERE, according to the Consciousness of both “Good and Evil”, and in proportion to their Consciousness of them. The only thing to blame then, is ignorance. If you ask what caused ignorance, I reply,—“it had no cause, but is a matter of fact because we are ignorant”, since, Thought and Intelligent development require Time

in which to work and develop. There is no other way to distinguish between ignorance and wisdom than by growth it is so, and happy are they who are wise, or not entirely ignorant. It refers to this distinction when it says, "Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder". The life of the body is a great deal a case of if you pass along about the time an earthquake takes place, or a trolley car hits your form of existence, that you are dealt with by such incidents, and not because of a God making it so, nor because of a Satan making it so. Perhaps too, you are better off by making your exit in this way, since you may escape the effects of a prolonged disease, or a condition that may change your past good life for one of evil. That is, you may leave your good environment and dwell where the evil environment is greatest, and will be subject to it, because many devils—individuals in the form of One Evil will have power to throw off the little good there is in you. Jesus illustrated this—the power of suggestion, when he went "APART TO PRAY". That is, the Natural was so prominent in those of his company—the disciples were even so—that he had to be "alone with God", that this Higher Thought—God would develop more strength in Conscience in order for him to meet the opposite. That the Devil or Satan—Evil in the form of man is incurable in the worst state, or "CANNOT STAND" before that Lord or God—Good in the form of man is illustrated by the following in Matthew 8:31. "So the devils besought him, saying, If you cast us out, suffer us to go AWAY into the herd of swine", which also il-

illustrates the animal nature or devil is not the life for man as taught by Jesus, or that such a condition is more characteristic of the animal as shown by "the swine". It is then, that man in disease or such bodily conditions shall understand "death is the greatest deliverer" as Job said,—“My Soul chooseth death”—My Sense chooseth death, because my Sense cannot stand and live before this Sense of a Higher life.

Occult Science, like some of the other Sciences, have aimed to find the Truth by looking "within", and so call it "hidden", or a Truth because it is hidden. I argue that there is no existence that can be hidden or within. As Spencer would say, "Because we cannot see that transition has taken place, is proof that it has not taken place." But, Spencer should likewise have known that there is no "Unknown", since nothing exists but that which is known, or, though it may not be known the same at one time, it is known to change by development and then is known only differently, but is known just the same. It is proof then, that God did not exist the same before the time of Jesus, and when Jesus lived he made known, not an unknown, but a known God, therefore, nothing hidden since it did not exist until the time of Jesus which we can call the Revelation, because it was revealed by him, just as any invention becomes known when it is invented by the inventor, and could not exist until the invention was made known. Some people, as in Occult Science, believe they see it, or believe it is there because they cannot see it. They "believe" because a thing is not seen by the eye, that it is discernable thru "insight". But, it is seen by the

eye, if they would see it by the things that are made. The things discernable thru Reason being the things UNSEEN by the things that are made, for, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also". In other words, He that hath seen me—the body, hath seen the Thought also, for, I—the body and my Father—Thought are one, since, in no other form can the Thought or Father be expressed, therefore it is not an "Unknown God", but to be known as an existence by the body expressing it. "Ye have eyes and see not, and ears and hear not", because ye have not Reason, since the eyes are not necessary to see this Truth, nor the ears necessary to hear this Truth, when we understand it is represented by Consciousness, and so called "within", but being without and within also when ONE by manifestation. The Higher or Spiritual Thought lives forever as its name signifies, while the Natural Thought and Error must "pass away", for it says concerning Truth, "Not my words, for they are Spirit and they are Life", and shall not—pass away—become extinct. You may "believe" the Spirit passes from the body, or lives on, or passes from one body to another after death, but I argue that ONLY LIVING BODIES OF THINGS are the representatives of the things that SEEM TO BE UNSEEN. If God and Satan work; I—body must work also. I cannot be more nor less than "I am". If I reflect life and death principles, then I am the object of such principles. Emerson says, "On my saying, 'What have I to do with the sacredness of traditions, if I live wholly from within?' my friend suggested,—'But these impulses may be from below, and not from above.' I re-

plied, 'They do not seem to me to be such, but if I am the Devil's child, I will live then from the Devil.' No law can be sacred to me, but that of my nature. Good and bad are but names very readily transferable to that or this,—the only right is what is after my constitution; the only wrong what is against it."

Jesus "overcome the world", but not death, although it appeared later to be so by his followers, and does appear so to-day to many who have and do believe in something existing outside of the body. What Sense would there be in this remark,—“I have overcome the world”, if he did not overcome, and refer to the sexual, for, it is the only thing he did overcome, and not this, until after “the fast”, since he lived as others lived in all other walks of life. You cannot associate this remark after what is called “the ascension”, because it is recorded as said by him in the gospels. It reads—“Not every man that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven”. This “unto me” refers to the Spirit and not Jesus—Jesus speaking of the Spirit as “Lord, Lord”. The “my Father” is also my Thought as Jesus Thought, and therefore the Father of Jesus spoke as the Father—Thought, because it was the Thought—Father of Jesus. This verse admits positively of no excuse, or any hope (“hope is deceiving”) for the man who has not lived the Spiritual life wholly as outlined by Jesus,—(He did not live it wholly, nor could he, any more than we) only to a greater extent than we, as I shall aim to prove later on. He even admitted this, or admits

it in the remark,—“ There is only one Good and that is God ”, when his followers looked up to him as being their superior. It seems to be characteristic of people to be always looking to this or that person as Superior, and Jesus wished to be excluded from this class, for this is why we have “ masters ”, and this is why people cannot or could not learn to be more equal in the time of Jesus as he taught and wished it so, and so it is to-day. We look up to this or that man, and so we are not equal to him because we have made ourselves unequal, by looking to him as superior. We elevate him more than he elevates himself. The above quotation is positive and true that the life he taught is to be here lived. Emerson says, “ When I talked with an ardent missionary and pointed out to him that his creed found no support in my experience ”, he replied: “ It is not so in your experience, but is so in the other world ”. I answer: Other world: There is no Other world. God is one and omnipresent: here or nowhere is the fact ”.

I have given in my subject of God and Satan, the definition of both, or that God signifies a Spiritual life and Satan a Natural life for man, and in the following I give an interpretation of Angels, God, Heaven, etc., though I have used them in the same terms heretofore, but, here the definitions follow the quotations from the Bible in uniform.

WORDS

DEFINITIONS.

Matt.	“ The Angels of	The Thoughts of
20: 30	God in	Spiritual life are the
	Heaven	Highest conception of
		Life and Immortality

	WORDS	DEFINITIONS.
Rev.	"The Angels of	The Thoughts of
12:9	Satan in the	Natural life are the
	Earth".	Lowest conception of
		Life and Mortality.
Luke	"The Kingdom of God ..	The Spirit of Thought
17:20	Cometh not with	Cometh not with
	observation	observation
Matt.	"In the day of	In the day of
16:20	Judgment"	Understanding.

The day of understanding is upon us, for, we are beginning to understand—judge which is the Truth. Henry Drummond says, "No man can study Modern Science without a change coming over his view of Truth. What impresses him about nature is its solidity. He is there standing on actual things." In other words, Here in the world can only be experienced that which will bring about the Truth, since there are no "actual things" to work upon outside of Nature. When "The Resurrection"—The Knowledge of the Spirit, the Word, and the Truth of Life is understood, then also is the beginning of the resurrection of man unto Spiritual Life. When a Higher—Heaven and Spiritual Life—God is revealed unto man, then, a Lower—Earth and Natural Life—Satan becomes a sin, because it is no more ignorance. So, then, in dealing with the resurrection and the angels, I trust you are coming into the realization that here in this verse the word "Angels" are Thoughts, because it associates itself with the word God and Satan. It is absurd to picture angels as men and women, though it might

AMUSE US, like we amuse children because of their ignorance. But, the idea of us being angels hereafter, should not be held up as such before children as a Truth, since, every Error planted in the Conscience of a child must later be uprooted in order to make room for the Truth as it really is, as, "man shall give account of every idle word". We, who are older should learn a lesson by experience, or, that it is very difficult to drop an Error or anything engrafted in us from childhood, so as not to burden the child with the same experience we have undergone, for, "because the father is a republican, the child will be one also". The Priest said "Give me a child until it is twelve years old, then you can have it the balance of the time." He knew full well what it means in the support of any doctrine. It would be much better if children, like older persons, were allowed more freedom on such things, that they might be led more by Truth than by us. We ought not to complain if the child tells us a falsehood, when the parents implant THE FIRST LIE by telling them "there is a Santa Claus". But, this is a good illustration of how we have been and are children, and to amuse us as we amuse children by telling of a Santa Claus, we have accepted A LIE for the Truth concerning the real life of man and his future. But like the children who shall not always remain a child and in ignorance, we too, shall not always remain the child of ignorance. I believe as Rousseau says in his book of Emile,—“Let the child take nothing for granted because some one says it is so. Nothing is good to him but what he feels to be good. You think it far sighted to push him beyond his understanding

of things, but you are mistaken. For the sake of arming him with weapons he does not know how to use, you take from him one universal among men, common sense: you teach him to allow himself always to be let, never to be more than a machine in the hands of others. You are continually saying to him, "All I require of you is for your own good, but you cannot understand it yet. What does it matter to me whether you do what I require or not? You are doing it entirely for your own sake". With fine speeches you are paving the way for some kind of a trickster or fool,—some visionary babbler or charlatan—who will entrap him or persuade him to adopt his own folly". How truly these words bring to bear on the present day characteristics. We have criminals grown and not "born" so, as the general opinion that all criminality is hereditary. I can in my observation name many "unfits" who are so because they were "let" by their parents and then subject to be let to others' influence. We see thousands holding positions to-day who are failures in the same because they were "let" to their parents. (i.e.) The parents will say to the child, "When you grow up I want you to be so and so—a doctor, a lawyer, etc." It matters not whether you are capable of being so, but "I think for you, and because I am your senior, I ought to know what is good for you, because you are too young to understand it." So, the child is not able to develop in it the faculties it should develop, but must try to develop in it the faculties which is in others, and that is impossible, but the parents see in the child only that which is good for the child—seemingly and so the child adopts something that is unfit

for its own talent, and finally, when it fails to make good in something it was never intended to be so by natural development, it becomes careless, and takes up anything suggested, and that often chances to be something along the line of criminology, because failures in everything generally lead to criminal acts as a last step. This reminds me of a case where the father was a shoemaker—a German who having sent his child to school with the intention of making not only a shoemaker out of his son, also wished him to take up certain studies to adapt himself to the business. The child did not seem to take to these studies, but during the hours of lesson would spend most of his time in drawing pictures on his slate. It happened one day he was drawing pictures, that his teacher chanced to see his slate, and thereon he had made the picture of his teacher. For this he received a sound flogging from his parent, as well as from the teacher. But this did not seem to change the child's views, though many times he was flogged for the same purpose of making pictures instead of taking up the lessons chosen by his father. He soon became tired of this and leaving school, ran away from home. When away from home and under his own guidance he soon took up painting, and he is to-day one of the best artists in Germany. So, let the child alone, that the Truth as to its future life in Religion and trade may develop, instead of the one you wish it to develop, while perhaps, in yourself, you have made a great failure. Your religious views have brought you failure too, since it is not in keeping with a more progressive growth and understanding that comes thru experience, rather than thru belief alone built

upon theory. Many people are expecting to see Jesus "appear" again, but this blindness of waiting will never open the door to his coming. When he was talking to the multitude he said,—“For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many.” In other words: one Creed says, “I preach Christ or Christianity in Truth”, and another says, “I preach Christ also”, until we have “many” in the name of Christ—Christianity, but not ONE living up to what he referred to as the Truth. Jesus followed by saying, “By their fruits ye shall know them.” Judging—understanding by the Evils committed not only by the members of Churches, but by its ministers and those persons claiming to be Christians, we can see what the “fruits” of such teaching is, and the result of their preaching, and so are able to Judge—understand they do not preach Christ in Truth, for, “by their fruits ye shall know them”.

“This is life Eternal to know God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent”, and not according to the general opinion “will be life eternal”. If man looks at what “IS LIFE ETERNAL”, which IS Thought instead of Material for motion or organic life merely,—he is enlightened to the fact that the actual Truth about his existence IS HERE, or to be experienced here, rather than TO BE LIVED in an uncertain locality. Jesus said, “Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and live, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life,—and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” You will note here also that “the resurrection”

refers to "damnation", and not to "the resurrection" of what you would like to call it, and that it does not necessarily refer to you as coming "forth", to be resurrected from this life to another life hereafter. So, "the resurrection", as the Knowledge of a thing, which thing is here referred to as that of the True life of man, for, to have the True Knowledge of life is to have "the resurrection" of life, which knowledge will bring "forth" the Truth concerning Eternal Life, while, to have the wrong knowledge of life, is to have "the resurrection of damnation", because it will bring "forth" the Error concerning Eternal life—both resurrections bringing forth its kind. The above statement has given some the idea that "graves" refers to where people are buried, which, of course, is true in the case where people are buried, but this is not THE DEATH of people, but the death of Truth being buried,—so "the graves" is the Conscience of man, or men because more than one grave is referred to, and the Thoughts therein are "THEY WHICH SHALL COME FORTH", and do come forth, for, "they that have done good to the resurrection of life", and they that do good, are the Spiritual Thoughts, Angels of God, while, "they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation", and they that do evil, are the Natural Thoughts—Angels of Satan. It was said by Jesus that "they might have life MORE abundantly", which disapproves the idea that man is under a death sentence NOW, but will receive Eternal Life hereafter, for, "they that never perish", are "my words, for they are spirit and they are life", and not you and I in the form that is to perish or live

until the Truth has had its final say over Error. Jesus said, "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." That is, Man and the Idea shall be "saved" from Evil, because, thru this "door" of understanding that God is "everywhere present" as the words "go in and out and find pasture" thus signify, he shall not be and cannot always be controlled by Evil.

It says in Matthew 25:35, "For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty and ye gave me drink,—I was a stranger and ye took me in." Jesus refers to the Christ Idea as "hungered", which is the same Truth that "shall hunger no more" as spoken of in Revelation when man upholds—manifests the Truth—God only. "Revelation" refers to the day of understanding when the Truth is revealed in its exact Truth and form. So, they that will uphold—feed on this Truth shall give Him—Truth—"Meat", because the result of feeding—upholding the Truth before the people will increase the Truth and lessen Error. The Christ Idea is and has been "a stranger" according to the past and even present idea, but, in "the day of judgment", or when a better understanding is visible, ("The veil is taken away"). "Ye took me in".

We will now turn our attention more to "the fast", which is an important step in the right direction towards bringing out what it really means toward the Truth. I find some men have made "fools" of themselves, by abstaining from food for "forty days" and others believe that "the flesh" of animals should not be taken. It seems that most

anything is allowed in Religion, in order to avoid the Truth in that it would convict itself if it preached the true "fast" and did not live it. Meat and food and pleasure in games and amusements are not the things to abstain from, or to which "the fast" refers. Sexual indulgence is "the flesh" to abstain from, because it is the only thing contrary to Spiritual growth, and is "the flesh that is against the Spirit" and that which when over indulged in is the cause of the worst forms of disease, because it weakens the body and so makes the body subject to disease. This is "the fast", and not "the flesh" of animals which we must fast—abstain from. We hear on every side—"it is according to nature, so why not indulge and even freely in it?" Granting that it is according to nature, we may have stepped beyond the laws of nature. The law of nature is to multiply. Neither does the fast allude to any specified time, or "forty days". This "forty days" refers to the life of Jesus and not man in general, or that man is to set apart so many days in which to fast. By secluding himself from the world—presence of such worldly company and environments that would tend to bring forth any Evil desire, Jesus was able to grow in strength thru the Higher Thought which he became more Conscious of by looking up to such a Principle of life. This also was his desire because he had passed thru an ordeal that he could not live to reach a more peaceful and better life—so he became Conscious of this desire—therefore, "praying and fasting"—desiring to and abstaining from this flesh—sexual indulgence for "forty days" gave him strength to meet the desire when it came up before him as is

illustrated by his remark,—“get thee behind me Satan”. Jesus could, after this fast, go forth into the world and be present with the sex, and not be subject to the Natural condition as heretofore he was tempted and yielded, for, he was like unto us and all men. He here proved how man is to be “born again”, though “born of the flesh”, for, after this fasting he was able to say to man,—“In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world.” This was because of “praying”—desiring to do so and such a remark is to illustrate how man—“all men” shall finally overcome the Natural condition, which will THEN BE “the end of the world”. This is the condition Paul refers to when he said “I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I.” “But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.” In speaking with a friend on this subject he said,—“If all people held the same view and did as you do and believe, what would become of the world?” I replied,—“the world existed thousands of years before you or man existed, therefore, what need I to worry over what shall become of the world?” What the result will be “no man knoweth, not even the Son”, so why should I, if I am living according to the teaching and Truth taught by Jesus care what the result shall be, since, “I can of myself do nothing” and am only subject to what I believe and live to-day. There are a class of people who believe they are “it” with a big I, and so they think if they leave their position in life, or a job of work, say,—“what will become of the position or job if I cease to be “it”? But

we find when they are gone and out, that even a more competent person is ready to fill the position. So, do not worry about the good old world, for it will Progress and move along without the helpmate of such men, since, they are but utterances of things which amount to nothing more than themselves in conceit, which are not needed along the line of growth, and Progress. So, after the fast, Jesus was able to say "get thee behind me Satan", and this "exceeding high mountain" to which it refers in the same chapter is significant of the HEIGHT of understanding Jesus had of both—Good and Evil, and the Power of the one to save man—the form from the other. Mr. Franz Molnar in his play called "The Devil", illustrates the above in the same manner by depicting "The devil" working in the Conscience, for, when pointing to the head of Karl Mahler, the artist in the play, and Olga Hofman, the banker's wife, he says, "I am here." So then, if the Higher Spiritual Thought or Angel is strongly impressed Mentally, it will "minister" unto us,—man, as it did UNTO HIM—Jesus as the example for man. So the "forty days" of fasting—abstaining from the sexual indulgence or its influence, is simply to illustrate how one is to go about to prove the Power can be strengthened in the Conscience by "praying to"—desiring to live the Higher—Heaven conception of life. Of course, it is also analogous to the fact that to abstain from a certain amount of food, or not to eat with excess in keeping with abstaining from the sexual, since food will increase the fluid to that extent it will require some kind of indulgence to take care of the same, and one need live only on

a light diet when abstaining from the sexual. It is absurd to even think that Jesus was "the son of God" and then think that he should be expected to "fast", or there would be no Sense to the idea that he should fast, if he or any individual was the Son of God. He was the Son of God in the Sense that he Manifested the Truth CONCERNING the Higher Life, when he did not Manifest the opposite or Lower Life as he did BEFORE THE FAST, and as he even expressed a desire to live the Natural life after the fast while in company with Mary Magdalene. So then, it is NO FAST AT ALL, nor a "sacrifice", to abstain from one kind of food and amusement, since, IT IS VERY EASY TO GIVE UP one or two kinds of food and amusement, and THEN SIMPLY SUBSTITUTE OTHER FOOD and amusements. Such hypocrisy WILL NEVER RENDER VIRTUE its just dues. To abstain from Sexual indulgence is a REAL "FAST", and a sacrifice, because there is no other so-called pleasure—flesh—to fill its place in the world, and such is "the flesh which lusteth against the Spirit" of God. Paul says, "Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither if we eat not are we the worse." Jesus said, "How is it that ye do not understand, that I spake not concerning bread"—food or flesh of any kind—"that ye should beware of the Pharisees, and of the Sadducees?" "Then understood they how that he bade them NOT beware of the leaven of bread,—but of the DOCTRINE of the Pharisees, and the Sadducees," because such a belief of abstaining from food and flesh as a "DOCTRINE" of the Truth would not destroy "the

flesh", but really hinder the Truth or Christ Idea of life to be HERE LIVED. "In the world ye shall have trouble" which is caused by living "after the flesh"—sexual, and not flesh—meat or food of any kind,—according to two of the greatest teachers—One, Jesus the prophet and example of the Truth, and the other, Paul, the follower and DOER of the example. Jesus understood then as did Paul that it would not be practical to dwell much on such a subject too deep for "the natural man" as Paul said,—“The natural man knoweth not the things that be of God, for they are FOOLISHNESS unto him, neither CAN HE KNOW THEM, for they are Spiritually discerned.” (i.e.) The Physical student and man working along physical lines only, knoweth not the things that be of Thought, for it is mentally discerned, and so naturally lived instead of Spiritually so. Meat is mentioned very often in the Bible, and many interpretations give it in such a sense, so that to-day there are thousands living in obedience to a “theory”, or “doctrine of the Pharisees”, which shows ignorance of the real Truth aimed at by Paul and Jesus. “The meat that perisheth not”, is the Spiritual Word—Christ, as Jesus says when referring to this Truth,—“I am the bread of life.” This IS and HAS life, because it IS life, and is the meat—“food from heaven”, since it is the Highest conception of life. The followers of Moses “received bread” a kind of Truth from “THE DESERT”—poor understanding that Moses had of God, and is not “the true bread from heaven”, for, “to-day when Moses is read, the veil” of misunderstanding is visible, “which veil”—blindness—“is taken away in Christ”. It says

in John 6: 32, 33 and 35,—“Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. “For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. “And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.” There is considerably more in this “bread of life” than we have seen or can experience to-day, but the time “is at hand, or now is” when we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to partake—“have part” or eat of this bread, as much of it as we are able. It involves much more than we had expected, if we take it in its entirety. It is the great builder of man, because it is his sole help from degeneracy. Jesus did not refer to himself as “the bread of life”, but that the Logos or Infinite Principle—Thought—“Father” is the bread—life which cometh down from heaven—the highest conception of life. He spoke not of himself—the individual self—for the Father—Spirit—Thought spoke in him. In the above sentence, Christ—the Eternal Idea of life is the One Jesus referred to as the “Word”, and called Jesus Christ because associated with Jesus and all mankind as the Manifestation of the Christ. So, “I am the bread of life”—inasmuch as I live the Christ life as Paul says, “I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.” Jesus wished to be excused from living after the Christ Idea as is illustrated by this remark,—“If it were possible let this cup fall from me.” Then he again became Conscious of the fact that he should manifest the Truth only, and finished

by saying, "Not my will but thine be done." This "will be done" reminds me of the nonsensical remark of our former president, placing his assassination as being connected with the work and hand of a God, when he said "God's will be done." But it has been and is the same murderous idea held by those who preach the ignorant doctrine of what God is, and so, kill and destroy and EXCUSE THEMSELVES by saying "it is the will of God".

But I cannot condemn in the "capitalist class" the nature which is the same that exists in the laboring class. In other words, I find all men by nature are selfish, and so the fault lies not in the man alone that he is aiming to take from the other what seemingly belongs to the other, since it has been and is a law of nature that the more powerful animal works to destroy the other. The less fortunate have the same selfish motives, but have not had the opportunity to enforce them. So, it is not to destroy the "capitalist class" as a man, that will remove the selfishness of man, since, you cannot destroy tyranny, by destroying a tyrant, because other tyrants exist because of a selfish existence. The only thing then is to destroy selfishness and greed. It is because of selfishness and the brute nature that laws to protect one are made, which means to say if there were no selfishness, there need be no laws, for, what profit would it be for me to take from my brother if I have sufficient to live on, and the fact I only consume so much during my natural existence? The wars at present and at all times are but the result of selfishness. The Kings and their allies preach to the people that "by the aid of God we hope to win"—making God a part of

their own selfishness, and so the masses being, of course, likewise selfish in that it will benefit them,—hurry to take up arms against their fellow men. “There shall be wars” simply illustrates the existence of brute nature, which cannot cease until this selfishness and hatred of “Nation against Nation” shall be abolished with a more brotherly feeling. God represents a distinct or Spiritual Law from the Natural Law and so has nothing to do with Nature and its laws, only *in the abolition of the same*. Spencer illustrates the non-brotherly feeling in the following,—“If the due performance by the state of its all-essential function had been the question on which elections were fought, we should not see, as we do now, that a shivering cottager who steals palings for firewood, or a hungry tramp who robs an orchard, gets punishment in more than the Hebrew measure, while great financial frauds which ruin their thousands bring no punishment.” But, we are all along, more or less dependent upon each other, as by a law that it is so, since, there must be an exchange made in whatever trade there may be existing as an opposite direction it is so to one another. But one exchange has grown larger in proportion, and so by this, we see in ourselves the growth of selfishness, in that if there is an opportunity open, we demand more in exchange than what is right from the other. It is thru this excessive demand that the knowledge of more equality is ascertained and being confident that such a law is not original with any law of growth, it is no more than proper that such a law should be condemned by the law of growth, which shall lie in the power of man thru growth to destroy in time this selfish-

ness. So then, life—the Devil or Satan—Evil in such a government cannot always stand, since “Truth will out” in all problems. But as one lie upholds another, as the Truth when that Truth is found to be a lie, it can only be shown so as not to continue as a Truth when it cannot continue in the race of society as a whole, or upon a more equal basis. As it is not my intention to deal much with problems of life in general, only as an acquisition to point out the greater problem of life concerning one of the Higher Mentality, we will here turn again to the latter by reference made to it in the Bible.

In John 11: 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, it reads, —“Now a certain MAN was sick, NAMED Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. When Jesus heard THAT, he said, this sickness is NOT UNTO DEATH, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby. “When he had heard therefore that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was. “These things said he: and after that he said unto them, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. “Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep he shall do well. “Howbeit, Jesus spake of his death,—but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep. “Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead. “And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe: nevertheless let us go unto him.” You will note the italics used in “man” and “named”, which illustrates the idea that this *man named* Lazarus is distinct from the Son—Truth to be glorified—

170 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

elevated, and that MAN NAMED is that which is subject to death and decay, yet, Lazarus as I shall aim to prove was not in such a condition of sickness, death and decay, but APPEARED SO to the people. Jesus here "raised" MAN'S opinion—"Lazarus"—from "the dead" principles of life to that of the True and living Principles of life thru this form of Lazarus, so that the Truth concerning God might be RAISED, and thereby glorified—elevated and worshipped by man rather than "the dead" principles and ceremonies generally taught. The resurrection—Knowledge of the dead—Truth as you ought to perceive by the verses written here was not to follow at some future time as they and we have even held to this day in regard to us, and so refers to the Truth always and man also during its development. Why did Jesus claim that Lazarus was "asleep", and then change his plan to that of death? It was the disciples' idea that Jesus spoke "of taking of rest in sleep", or "spake of his death", and not that Jesus really referred to the death as a fact, as we shall presently see. They, like we, supposed this sleep—hypnotic state—was really death, and therefore said "he shall do well", and so is dead—the Word is dead—to the generation of believers in death, as he said finally when the word "sleep" did not have its effect,—“Lazarus is dead”. The idea that man shall die or sleep until a certain time and then awake—rise—is a false statement, and shows as it illustrates here the ignorance of the Power of Thought and Mental over the Physical and Natural body, and to save man from destruction HERE, nevertheless, God—Thought cannot save man here until it—Thought

has destroyed the whole of the Natural condition. Jesus said "Lazarus is dead", that they who believed such theories should SEE MAN ARISE FROM THE PRINCIPLE OF DEATH NOW in proportion as he is able to receive—be conscious of the Truth of Spiritual Life NOW. This APPEARED "miracle", for there is no miracle in the Knowledge of Truth, was performed for the purpose of showing man that he should experience this life now as much as possible, else there would be no sense to the argument of raising "Lazarus" from the dead—principles of death as it is illustrated here. Continuing in John 11: 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, we read,—“Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. Jesus saith unto her, thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus saith unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this? She saith unto him, yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.” Martha said, “I KNOW that he shall rise again in the resurrection”, but Jesus contradicts this, and OUR knowing—believing—by saying, “I am the resurrection and the life”. “He that believeth and liveth in me shall never die”, is analogous to the fact that you must not only “believe”, but must LIVE this life, but, as we have unknown the known and so cannot live or, “liveth” it fully, we cannot expect to experience it Wholly. Jesus said in re-

gard to this misused and abused word "believe",—"If thou say to this mountain, be thou removed and believe it can be done, it shall be removed". But we have not found the person who is so foolish as to believe such, and so we know it cannot be done, because we cannot believe it, and, of course, it could be done if you could believe it. The quotation illustrates how foolish it was for Martha or any one to believe impossibilities, or that a dead body could be made to come to life again, yet, if you could believe it, in experience, it could be done, and also illustrates the power and influence belief has in the life of man. Spencer truly says, "we know nothing more of existence than a continued manifestation," because there is no other existence than what is known as life. So we have all been as blind as Martha, as to the "resurrection" of that which cannot be resurrected. Martha claimed to "believe", but to believe man—Lazarus should experience—rise now—the Spiritual life while living in the world, was just as impossible in her time as it is to-day. That her brother would "rise AGAIN in the last day", or at some future time and place as WE HAVE "believed" was also as far as she could see and believe with her understanding, which illustrates ignorance of the Truth. Not the resurrection of the dead BODY was this "brought forth" to prove, but that the Word and Truth of Spiritual Life, or Christ as the Idea of Life was to be resurrected—acknowledged ABOVE that of the Natural or Adam Idea of Life which is death. This Idea could not exist "since the foundation of the world" because the Thought of Good and Evil had not developed to its true height of understanding until

Jesus received it. "Though he were dead, yet shall he live", was a direct remark to Martha THEN, and therefore illustrates that it cannot refer to an after life, nor to a continued life to the then and now individual, but refers to the Truth or Dead that should and shall live by man. Paul illustrates this in his remark,—“I die daily”,—that is, he put off each day as much as possible the Natural condition by living the Spiritual Truth as a condition THEN, as it is to be now by you and I as the Truth works in us as it did in Jesus, “This is” and now is, “the resurrection”—Knowledge of Spiritual Life TO BE LIVED, and so makes us in unison and like Jesus in his claim that “I am the resurrection and the life”, because, thru this knowledge lived by man as illustrated by Jesus, will the Truth be “made alive forevermore”. Note the final answer given by Martha to the question put to her by Jesus,—“I believe that thou art the Christ”, which is not AN ANSWER TO HIS QUESTION AT ALL, but really EVADES HIS QUESTION, and so illustrates ignorance of what he was talking about.

I have no doubt but that Jesus did feel in a way, that he would be saved from death, and why not? Since, nearly these two thousand years have we believed the same thing, and Jesus was no exception to the average believer when he gave some thought of himself. No doubt he thought he was “the Son of God” as an individual, because he did not understand the exact meaning of Power in the term that it could be applied to a person in the form of mesmerism, hypnotism, etc., and so believed this Power was of God, or a Being, and

174 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

that he—because he was able to use it had formed the opinion that he was the Son of this Being. If to some extent he and man had not believed and feared, where would we—man—have been to-day? This is, of course, proof here, that in an ignorant generation it is folly to be wise. Jesus and Paul did things contrary to Truth in order to elevate the Truth as Paul says,—“For if the Truth of God hath more abounded thru MY LIE unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?” We have been taught to fear, and so fear has withheld us and Progress, and because of this we have also suffered and will suffer in all walks of life because of fear. But to-day we are learning thru a better understanding the meaning of fear, or, that “fear hath torment, and fear killeth”, also, “he that feareth is not made perfect in love”. We are learning not to fear God, nor anything Good, but rather to destroy anything contrary to Good. It is because some have feared and believed, that they have been free from violence to others, which is the one thing Religion has done and is doing, and should receive some credit in keeping such a class from violence, yet, it is not the true way in which to destroy violence. Such teaching, if continued will hinder Progress. So, I term there are two classes of people to-day,—one, a religious class calling themselves Christians, who do no wrong because of a fear of some God,—the other, a scientific class, called infidels by Christians, (but only infidels in name, as those are Christians in name only who call themselves Christians), who do no wrong because of a conscious State having developed to that State of Consciousness which hinders them from

doing evil, since it would go against Conscience. The so-called Christians will fall into this class as soon as they have received the same knowledge, and will be more truly Christians, since, they will do nothing wrong when they have no excuse to be forgiven, which will result in ending evil much sooner than to believe an evil can be committed and then forgiven. The latter class work in the interest of the present, while the others work to the interest of the future. They are the social class, because they are less selfish in that they anticipate no future for the good they do here, while the others only do good here for what they hope to be paid for hereafter. So, we can readily see why Jesus could entertain **SOME HOPE** for the future, even, if he did not look to the future as some of his followers are doing.

In order to prove my previous and present statement that Jesus was and is not "the Son of God", as he may have believed, I need only to mention his **LAST WORDS**. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This is a remark wholly and absolutely uncalled for, if he could **THEN** on the cross realize that he was really "the Son of God", other than the representative of the Word—Christ—while in life he lived the Truth according to the Spiritual Idea. These last words illustrate his mistake during life in looking for any future for him and man generally, for it is the work of God and Satan working to **THEIR OWN END**,—one, to the end of immortality, and the other to the end of mortality. He had no chance to change here and give a different opinion to the people when he had, at the last moment, found his belief for him-

176 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

self had been shattered as is expressed by the words spoken, since, there was no God or a Being to save man, or to work with man after death. If God performed thru Jesus, all the so-called miracles as a Being instead of the Thought as Power, why not answer the people who said,—“ If he come down now, we will believe him ”, or “ save yourself ”, and that will give us proof. It was just as reasonable for him to “ come down ” then, as to “ rise from the grave ”,—in fact, it would have been more reasonable and no chance for a doubt, and he could then have made his disappearance—“ ascension ”. We must have proofs in order to entertain facts, because we cannot get any understanding without proof. The principle of mathematics furnishes us with a Rule whereby we can PROVE THE ANSWER. So likewise, must we have the answer to the question,—“ save yourself ” by proving it is so by saving yourself from death. To “ come down ” would have been a GENUINE MIRACLE, and not a case of deception, or, “ my lie ”, in the form of mesmerism as we call and understand it to-day when the mortal sense is stilled by the Power of Thought of one over another. It would also prove God is separate from man as a Power over man in the form of a Being, but it proves—to me—as I say time and again that God works when man works, or man works when God works, or THEY ARE ONE as Jesus said, “ I and my Father are one ”. We have a beautiful illustration of the dead, or the Spiritual and Natural Idea, in the “ Prodigal Son ” as given in Luke 15:24, saying,—“ For this my son was dead and is alive again.” The Son here was not dead, but

was dead to the Father, so long as absent from the father. So Jesus was not dead to the Father when he expressed the Spiritual Thought—God only, and was THEN “present with the Father”, but he could not associate himself with God when he said “let this cup pass from me”, because that expresses the Natural desire to live the Natural—flesh life. (“For this my Son was dead.”)

I trust I am making this distinction of life and death clear to you as to what was resurrected, instead of the idea that Lazarus was really resurrected. So, Jesus saith unto her, said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldst believe, thou should see the glory of God”? Let us here turn again to what Jesus says in Matthew 22: 31 and 32. “But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, “I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.” In other words, God—Thought works throughout all generations as this verse illustrates three generations, or, “He is God—Thought and work of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the form of a continued existence of Life, for God—Thought is not the God—Work of the dead, but of the living, because life cannot work in the form of the dead. Jesus did not raise Lazarus from any death, for he had as much to do with the death—sleep—hypnotic state of Lazarus, as he did with the awakening—coming forth from “sleep”. That Jesus regretted to make this deception or, “my lie” in order to glorify God—elevate the Thought—is illustrated in John 11: 41 and 42. “Then they took away the stone FROM THE PLACE where

178 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up HIS eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. "And I knew that thou hearest me always but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." You will remember by the remark made heretofore that Jesus first remarked to the disciples that Lazarus was "NOT DEAD BUT SLEEPETH", in order to try their faith in him or his teaching, but perceiving their lack of faith and understanding and unbelief he then said "Lazarus is dead". If they had believed thru the first remark—"not dead but sleepeth", then Jesus would have gone immediately to the home of Lazarus where he lay in sleep—sickness "unto death", for you will note after he heard of the sickness of Lazarus that "he abode TWO DAYS in the SAME PLACE where he was". This gave Jesus an opportunity to work on Lazarus as a subject, or to bring him under the Hypnotic state while in the form of sickness he had power to do so. To bring Lazarus out from under the influence of sickness would not convince the people that he—Jesus was the example of Truth, since he had done this many times to other people, and still, they believed him not. So here was an opportunity to go a step farther as a "lie" to aid the Truth, and so he remained near by—"the same place where he was" in order that the time required—"two days"—for a burial should take place. There is a regret in the remark of Jesus—"But because the people stand by I said it", and did it, for, as God is not one that "sees" and "hears" and "says", only in appearance to an ignorant generation, so this remark illustrates an error made,

and the wish afterwards to be relieved in Conscience, as the error—deception—miracle—was made in good faith. That thru such; the people would believe more in what Jesus said in regard to what he Thought was the Truth. We can conclude here, that he had control, so to speak, over Lazarus and his friends after being in company with them so many times, and because they acknowledged him as a superior person. We know to-day that in many cases where a person has been hypnotized by another, that that person can be hypnotized by that person against the will of that person and at a distance. However, Jesus was evidently ignorant of this Power as Hypnosis in the form of transmission of Thought, and so believed it the work of a God or Being working thru him, since, he knew Lazarus was not in a state of death as a reality. It is impossible to change the Reality of anything, or to get life out of a dead form, or to bring a dead form to life, as he says, "God is not the God of the dead but of the living". If you believe that Jesus believed in a God as a Being, and that he was a Son of this Being, instead of working as I have defined as Thought in the form of Being, and then the Son of such,—you have only to lay aside the selfish view of Jesus in order to bring about the true conception as I here define as Thought, since, we are to take Jesus at his word in "taking no thought what ye shall say"—meaning that when we take thought of our remarks they are selfish, or of a selfish nature. So the remarks that are not selfish and made by Jesus are those remarks we are to define only, else we become contradictory in definition. No doubt Jesus, if he had seen and

read some of the words spoken by him after they were written,—that he would have denounced them as words spoken by him, because he spoke so much in the absence of self Consciousness.

In John 12: 34, it reads,—“ The people answered him. We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever; and how sayest thou, The son of man must be lifted up? who is this son of man? ” In John 14: 20, it reads “ At that day ye shall know that I AM in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.” They heard it right, that Christ “ abideth forever ”, and the “ Son of man ” to be “ lifted up ” is when man born of the flesh shall hear this Word and live accordingly. The remark made elsewhere in the Bible that “ Ye shall dwell with him ”, if taken figuratively, or in a Natural—selfish view, or separate person and form of existence would seem probable as a future habitation for man, but now we read in the above that “ I am IN my Father, and ye in me ”, which contradicts the idea—selfish—of the form of Jesus and man and God, and is therefore evident that the DWELLING IN, or, “ to dwell with him ”, refers to a Conscious State of Being present with God or Truth NOW. At that day ye—man shall know, is a remark addressed to all and knowing generations, and we can to-day get a glimpse of “ THAT DAY ”, because this is the generation of a better understanding of what the words or parables in the Bible refer to, as this is “ the day of judgment ”, therefore the “ SECOND COMING ”. Jesus could not be any “ part ” with “ the last day ”, yet, the “ part ” he did have in the resurrection and “ the last day ”, was the knowl-

edge and therefore the expression of the spiritual life in HIS DAY.

To give a more detailed account of "the Christ" as the Idea and Principle of life as it works to the end of Eternal things, I will refer to Paul in I Cor. 15: 16 to 24th verse. "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." That is, if the Christ or Idea of Spiritual Life is not above—"raised"—the Jesus or Adam Idea of Natural Life in your Conscience, then the Mortal belief cannot be destroyed, so that man may rise above the Natural conditions, and therefore are they dead, or "rise not". "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins", (i.e.) no faith and belief but the Christ Idea can raise man above the Natural, for we are proving to-day that faith in the Natural things and Thought of the same, result in sin—sin only because it—the Natural hinders the Spiritual growth, which "faith is vain". "Then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished", (i.e.) they, the Natural Thoughts "are perished", because the Truth is affirmed, and have "fallen asleep in Christ"—destroyed by the Christ Idea. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men, most miserable" (i.e.) if we have hope "ONLY" in "THIS LIFE" of a Christ Life HEREAFTER, we are "most miserable" in "THIS LIFE", since, there is no other way by which the Evils and diseased conditions may be abolished, because medicine is fast failing to relieve mind and body, therefore, have hope in Christ NOW, which is the understanding of the Power of the Word or Christ over Evil and the world. "But now is Christ risen from the dead,

182 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

and became the first fruits of them that slept", (i.e.) Christ or the Word has been dead, owing to the lack of knowledge being developed in the Conscience of man, instead of the belief that "the Christ" is to appear in a form as Jesus, and so "NOW IS Christ risen from the dead", through a correct understanding—judgment of the Truth taught by Jesus, therefore, "the first fruits of them that slept", is a result of this awakening. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead", (i.e.) by man living under the Adam Idea of a Natural life, though impossible to do otherwise because of the Natural Law; was the Word dead—not understood—but thru the evolution of thought and understanding is the Word or Christ alive—understood, also signifying that these conditions are developed or evolved and embodied by man as the generations pass, as it says: "by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead"—the knowledge of the meaning of the dead as not referring to man directly, but to the Truth of Spiritual Life as a Thought—God to abolish the Principle of the Natural condition,—“For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ, shall all be made alive”, (i.e.) all who look to the Natural Idea of life here, and a Spiritual life hereafter, are under the Adamic Law of life and death; while those who look to the Spiritual Idea as a life to be here lived will assist—"have part" in bringing about the Truth, "But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming", (i.e.) All may TAKE PART, or PARTAKE OF "THIS LIFE" HERE, but, ONE GENERATION

AFTER ANOTHER SHALL DECLARE IT, that is, "MAN IN HIS OWN ORDER", "Christ the first fruits" is significant of the present generation, when the Spiritual—Christ Idea is affirmed during the Natural existence, while, "they that are Christ's at his coming", signifies THE END OF THE NATURAL CONDITION, since, it cannot COME—be present Wholly and exist ALONE as a ONENESS or ONE, where there are Thoughts of a Natural life and condition. The word "Christ's" is significant of "ALL MEN EVEN AS I AM", or all men living the ONE IDEA—CHRIST, therefore are they "CHRIST'S".

So then, Nature, as Emerson says, "works to its own end", while as Paul says Thought or "God worketh in you" to its own end.

Mrs. Eddy does not teach that there is a "Personal Being" yet she contradicts such a statement by saying "God had been graciously fitting me". To claim that as she says in another part of her work that "God is an Infinite Principle", makes these terms contradictory, because, only one person can "fit" another person to that or this. It requires the form of a person to dictate to another form of a person, therefore God must be—according to her idea of "fitting"—a Personal God. An "Infinite Principle" cannot dictate to a person, therefore Thought as I term God "worketh in you", and cannot dictate to a person, but is embodied in the form of Man as Man. This idea of "fitting me", has been so impressed with the followers of this—the teachings of Mrs. Eddy, that they believe she is "the woman" referred to in Revelation. The significant of this remark—"the woman"—is that

all knowledge is a state of Consciousness and so borne—developed and brought forth from the Conscience, just as a child is borne and brought forth from a woman. Thought—"God is no respecter of persons", but works thru and by such persons, whether it be a man or a woman. We speak of a boat; a train of cars and the like as "she", but there is no sign of them being a woman just because we refer to them as "she". It is just such mistakes that are responsible for the belief that this or that person is a favorite with God, and so "ordained" to be the true exponent of the Truth. Jesus was not "favored", but because he was born of a very religious mother and at an age when the Thought had developed to such a height as to be recognized by him because of his study along the higher plane of life than that of the Natural, which latter had been the custom of the others of his time, was he able to understand the Higher.

Jesus never referred to the Natural, or an earthly father and mother after he became Conscious of this Knowledge of the Spiritual Law, because there could be no mother and father to it, since it was and is an Idea that can only be fathered and mothered as Thought. Mrs. Eddy says "there is no record of Jesus calling any man on the earth father"; which would impress one with the idea of a record being in existence where he called a woman "mother". There exists **NO RECORD OF EITHER** in the Bible, because such would impress the idea that "the Christ" is born of man and woman, when, only Jesus as all men and women are born thru the process of Natural Law, though we may have **OPINIONS** as Mrs. Eddy has of the

birth of Jesus, or that he was "born of God and Mary". I will quote that part of a chapter where it speaks of "mother", when Jesus is addressed by his disciples in regard to his mother, which may be taken by some and Mrs. Eddy that he called her mother. When the disciples said to him: "Thy mother is standing without, desiring to speak with you," Jesus replied: "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand *toward his disciples, and said: Behold my mother and my brethren.*" The italics are mine, so as to impress you with the reference made in regard to what he looked at as "mother". Here he ignored the facts of a Natural existence, or father and mother, not that but what he knew and believed in such an existence, but only, in order to "HOLD FAST to that which is Good"—God, or as an Eternal existence of Thought as a Unity, as will be seen by his looking "TOWARD HIS DISCIPLES", instead of toward his mother. He said, "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father"—Thought—"which is in heaven"—Highest conception of life—"the same is my brother and sister and mother". This signifies that "Father"—Thought is a Unity, and should be expressed the same by all. "Brother and sister and mother" HERE indicate this, and the disciples should receive and live and give it out to the world as such—be a mother to it. Also, in verse 26 of the same chapter, his mother is not referred to as HIS MOTHER where he says to his mother, "Behold thy son", but that she should receive THAT DISCIPLE as a son; for, in the twenty-seventh verse

following he turns likewise to this disciple and says "Behold thy mother".

In St. John 20:9, it says, "For as yet they knew not the scriptures that he must rise again." Though Jesus had been with the disciples a great length of time, yet they had not known Christ as we have not known him, and so could not understand his meaning regarding his looking away from his mother. The latter part of the verse—"He must rise again from the dead"—is significant that he—the Truth in the form of the Christ Idea had risen ONCE from the dead when Jesus voiced it, but that it was not understood, as the word "again" will verify this, for it could not refer to Jesus, since he had not lived and died BEFORE THIS, and therefore could not "rise again".

In John 20:11, 12, 13 and 14 it says: "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping,—and as she wept, she stooped down, *and looked* into the sepulchre, And seeth two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her. Woman why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus".

We cannot say with accuracy where and how the body of Jesus was moved and placed, but we DO KNOW IT WAS NECESSARY TO REMOVE IT, and by his followers, in order to "FULFIL THE SCRIPTURES", or that the Truth may be more universally "believed" in an ignorant generation. While Mary "stood without

and weeping", the normal state of consciousness was replaced by a mesmeric state which was due to her absorbed thought of seeing Jesus, and therefore brought about the VISIONARY RESULT, or, "she saw the Lord". But we perceive that when she came back to her normal condition, that "the Lord was not there". This weeping and over-anxious thought for him, brought on a nervous condition wherein she could easily be influenced in her own conscience by suggestive thought of things not realities in form as really existing. It says: "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not: for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and to your God." Here it is plain that Mary could not reach a state of solidity in such a state of consciousness as to the Perfect state of man existing in real life, and for this reason a thought suggested that she could not "touch" him, since it could only be A VISION of the Truth in form. It was not the voice of Jesus that she heard, but the same echo that Spiritualists seem to hear from the "departed"—dead. It appeared to her as such, because she saw the vision of a form, or an illusion, therefore her own thoughts seemed to come from that source, which thoughts could easily be formed while in such a state, since the opposite view brings about a different state of thought. Mary had and could not ascend to that realm of consciousness which Jesus had taught while living in the deceptive state, therefore she could not "ascend to the Father" as is illustrated by these words seemingly coming from Jesus, as he could not while in such a state as she

believed. By the congregating "together" of the disciples, and their absorbed thought for Jesus, thru the teachings and their "belief" in seeing him; they were consequently more able to see the vision of him, and receive the thought of their own as coming from the vision, than the people who were not so interested and did not believe in spirits. The Word—Christ as taught by him must not be lost to sight, and for this reason it was a good thing for the disciples and persons in general, and even we of to-day, that the disciples were "ASSEMBLED TOGETHER", thru what Mary said to the disciples concerning her "seeing" the Lord,—which again brought about the vision of Jesus to them, and making the Truth appear more to them than thru his teaching alone. We, of to-day, may be thankful for what the disciples SEEMED TO SEE, else the whole spirit of the Letter—Word might have been lost. We ought to be thankful also, for what the INSANE PERSONS SEEM TO SEE, and learn a lesson from such a sight, that we may not go to the extreme indulgences in the different forms of Evil, which causes them to SEE THINGS. We learn a lesson from what the disciples have seen, even if it is an insane idea that man must die in order to live, as they and some of us believe by what they saw and some of us see. But it is not to "see" the Truth that gives us Truth, but to live according to it.

In Matthew 17:9, it says,—“And as they came down from the mountains, Jesus charged them, saying, tell the vision to no man until the Son of man be risen from the dead”. The word "vision", according to the best authorities, is "a phantom or

power of sight", therefore, NOT A THING REALLY EXISTING, or A REALITY OF BEING PRESENT. But we can imagine and even believe that this "vision" or "sight" of Truth seen by the disciples is to illustrate that the Word—Christ as the Idea of life will in time become a Reality, or a Visible and Eternal Existence, instead of the present Visible Existence of the Real and Unreal Idea of life—Christ and Adam—Spiritual and Material—Mental and Natural. The disciples then, saw ONLY A VISION of the Truth, according to the words of Jesus as stated in Matthew, therefore not a Reality. Jesus appeared to them here, only in a visionary way which is to illustrate that the "son of man" as mentioned, will appear in "the latter days" as Perfect, since he cannot appear at present in Reality, but only visionary, because the Wholeness of a Spiritual life cannot be lived in this generation. The Word—Christ is at present True, but ONLY VISIONARY, because it has been observed as a Vision, so, it is about time to ABOLISH THE VISIONARY IDEA AND TEACHING of a Spiritual Life in the future, that the "Vision" of Truth may become a present Possibility or a Reality. This state of mesmerism as referred to is nothing but another form of "trance", which we can imagine Paul was subject to, and seen much that was not a Reality while in a state of trance as referred to in Acts 22:17. "And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance."

Like all opinions which have builded their religions on chapters taken from some part of the

Bible, it is **HERE EVIDENT** that Spiritualism received its initial step. They have as great a right in the "belief" of their views being correct, as other religions based upon other views, that to my conception seem incorrectly interpreted. After making a thorough study of the scriptures, if it were possible to believe in such theories as the average religious belief, then, in this chapter where it speaks of "seeing" Jesus; I would not sentence such an interpretation and belief as is made by the Spiritualists who claim to have seen and talked with their departed friends, etc., in the form of Spirits. But, it is impossible for such a belief to be correct, as it is for the average religious belief, and they are **ONLY BELIEFS** based upon ignorance instead of the Truth. That the material—your body can be transformed, or come under the influence of a so-called spiritual body so they may converse with each other, and then separate, according to the Spiritualistic code is impossible in any Science or Scientific Sense. There can be no such representatives of life as a Spiritual body and a Material body—two bodies—other than what exists in Thought and body by expression—two lives lived in the world by one person or body as associated and relatively to the immortality of the soul, and the mortality of the body, for there is "no other world" existence. If you gave to a person a problem to solve, you could not conceive nor depend upon the answer coming from that person after death, but must pass it to the next one living if it has not been solved by the other, since, faculties of Thought only exist and live by that body which expresses life. So, the work of Spiritual Life is

now and has been embodied by us and those gone before, and if it is unable as it has been to be worked out during that—this bodily existence—and proof is that it is not, it will continue to Evolve until Perfection is reached by other existing bodies. The only reason then, for one person called Material, and being able to talk with another person CALLED (not so) Spiritual, is not because there are such, but because of a Mental State DUE TO SUCH A BELIEF. The individual becomes conscious of a reply made out of its own thinking. If you believe Mr. Jones is in the “Spirit World” (no such place), Mr. Jones will reply from YOUR OWN BELIEF, and if he is happy, as YOU THINK HE OUGHT TO BE, then he—you—will reply that he is happy, from what you think, though it may seem to come from some other place while you are under this state of mentality, which is “self mesmerism”. Very similar, are the experiences of those not in such mesmeric states when grouped together as in the case of Spiritualists. There are cases of, where what is termed “hallucinations” appear to the living as real, of which I quote part of an article: “Hallucinations and the world beyond”, written in “Hampton Columbian Magazines”. “The Rev. G. Lyon Turner, professor of philosophy at the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester, England, woke up one morning to find the ceiling of his room adored with a huge chandelier of some ten arms, and the jets shining brightly thru the ground-glass globes at the end of each arm. He knew that when he went to bed no chandelier had been there, and naturally feared that something was the matter with his eyesight. ‘I moved

my head,' he said, 'to see whether the phantom moved too.' But no, it remained fixed: and the objects and beyond it became more or less completely visible as I moved, exactly as would have been the case had it been a real chandelier. So I woke my wife, but she saw nothing.

"Still more bizarre was the phantasm that appeared to another Englishman. Here is his own account of it. "I had just gone to bed, and was—at least, this was my impression at the time—quite awake. The door of my room was ajar, and there was a light in the passage which half-illuminated my room. Suddenly I became aware of a series of slight taps on the passage outside. These taps were not sufficiently loud for a human footstep; on the other hand, the volume of sound was greater than that made by a walking-stick. I fully remember sitting up in bed and beholding two top boots trot rapidly across the room and vanish into the opposite wall. The illusion was astonishingly vivid, and I can recall the details to this day. I have never had a waking dream since."

"It sounds like a contradiction in terms to speak of ghosts of the living, but, as the census of hallucinations made evident, phantasms of persons still in the flesh, like phantasms of inanimate objects, are experienced fully as often, than phantasms of the dead. Obviously, in such cases there can be nothing objective about the apparitions. Yet to those who have seen them, phantasms of the living are quite as vividly realistic and make as profound an impression as phantasms of the dead, for which they are almost always mistaken, with consequent anguish to the persons whom they visit. To il-

lustrate, Miss A. Cressy, while seated with her mother and sister in the dining-room of their English home, happened to glance up and saw, looking in at them thru an open window, a brother who was supposed to be in Australia. 'Oh, Mother,' she exclaimed, 'here's a surprise for us! Tom has come home!' 'Tom home! Where is he?' 'Out on the lawn. I'll go and let him in.' She went to the front door and threw it open. No one was in sight. 'Tom!' she called. 'Where are you, Tom?' No answer. Then, thinking that in a jesting spirit he had hidden among the shrubbery: 'Come in, Tom. Don't play the fool. You know how weak your mother's heart is. Do you want to kill her?' Still silence. By this time her father had joined the little group at the front door, and all four made a rapid but thorough search of the grounds. No one was in them, nor could anyone have got away without being seen. Now, from the mother, came the wailing cry: 'It was not Tom you saw, but Tom's ghost. Tom is dead!' A year afterwards Tom came back from Australia in the best of health. Oddly enough, though, it develops that, at the time his 'ghost' appeared to his sister, he had been seriously ill of a fever, and in his delirium had constantly entreated his attendants to place him under a great cedar that grew on his father's lawn."

This last case, while but a vision, can be traced as to having its share in "Telepathy" believed in by eminent "scientists", of which space will not permit here to give proofs of its existence, nor, is it necessary, since it has no real connection with the subjects brought to bear. We are here led to be-

lieve that "seen" and "talked with persons dead", is but a vision and so term, mesmerism, and that it is simply on the increase because we are living in a more nervous generation, or when nervousness is more universally experienced, and this is why so many persons at evangelistic meetings being led by a strong personality are made converts, because they are in a hysterical condition brought on by suggestions from such a leader. Neither is it expected that you can mesmerize yourself into the Spiritual State while living in the Material, and if you fail to accept the Spiritual, or Christ Idea as the illustration is given in the Bible for that purpose,—then you are making no Progress towards a Spiritual Life here,—but, like the other, you too, are still mesmerized into believing you can see a Spiritual Life beyond, while you ignore the facts of Spirituality as a present possibility. Christian Scientists are under the above state of mesmerism, as I have learned thru their study of the words of Mrs. Eddy that such a belief is imminent. We have all been hypnotized in the true sense of hypnotism—dead. So, it is necessary for each person to be so absorbed into the Truth of Spirituality in order to become Spiritual, or at least, more so, "NOW and HERE", for "the time is at hand", or "NOW is come salvation", or, "for now IS our salvation nearer than when we believed", for, "God is omnipresent and Omnipotent". Why did not Jesus appear to ALL PEOPLE ALIKE, instead of just the few followers, if there was any such Truth that he could appear at all after death?

In order to give a more vivid impression of what I am aiming to prove is only temporal and visionary

at times, I will quote a few remarks from the best authorities on the subject of Mesmerism, which follows with the same affirmation by the same writers that Mesmerism and Spiritualism are correlated in their phrases.

"Those persons most readily susceptible to mesmeric influences generally prove to be the best mediums for spirit manifestation. That these phenomena in their higher phrases—as those of trance, healing by touch, and subjection to the thought and will of another mind—are intimately allied with those of mesmerism, is obvious to all who have given any careful attentions to them. Spiritualists, indeed, affirm that they differ only in this—that in the one case the operator is a mortal, in the other, a disembodied human spirit possessing a Spiritual body, instead of a physical one."

After making a thorough study of the above remarks, and other experiences and observations along similar lines, I can only form one conclusion,—that mesmerism and Spiritualism are ONE and the SAME thing. It would hardly be considerate for the spiritualist to claim any real connection with mesmerism, since such an idea would remove the religious feeling, and thereby lessen the faith of its followers. If "those persons most readily susceptible to mesmeric influence generally prove to be the best mediums for spirit manifestation", it might be well to turn our attention to those persons SUBJECT TO mesmerism.

"About 1774, Mesmer, a Viennese physician, commenced to treat diseased organs by the application of artificial magnets. The phenomena exhibited by his patients, especially the more nervous

kind, led him to adopt the view that the magnets operated not as a SPECIAL source of influence, but as conductors of a magnetic fluid which he could communicate at will to the patient, even at a distance.

"In 1785, a Royal commission was appointed to examine Mesmer's pretensions. These investigators found that the same phenomena could be produced in Mesmer's more nervous patients when blindfolded, by merely inducing them to suppose themselves in the neighborhood of any of Mesmer's magnetic appliances, though none were present; while conversely, magnets, and magnetic tree were like powerless, if the patient were kept unaware of their proximity.

"Preyer and Heidenbain in Germany, and Rieht in France, have confirmed and extended Braid's results, and we may therefore briefly sum up their results, premissing that no scientific observer has ever confirmed the statements of mesmerists, as to clairvoyance, reading of sealed letters, influence on unconscious persons at a distance, or the like, and, as above stated, the influence of the mesmerizer is unnecessary, and in all cases unimportant."

This sums up the problem that Mesmerism and Spiritualism are the same in action,—it being understood that by "inducing them to SUPPOSE themselves in the neighborhood of any of Mesmer's magnetic appliances" would produce the same results as if the "Medium" or "Mesmerizer" were present, because it is YOUR BELIEF and Thought or Mind which works. The influence of the Mesmerizer is "UNNECESSARY and in ALL CASES unimportant". It is necessary in Spiritualism and

mesmerism to obtain the desired effect, for, by and thru the "Medium" and "Mesmerizer" the persons present can be induced to "suppose themselves" to be in communication with persons in the form of Spirits, and the mesmerizer can make suggestions as to what is to be done by those under the state of being mesmerized, yet, neither have power over the other, since, it is the Thought working in the Conscience of the persons present who are under the state of being present with other persons. One person makes a suggestion to another, and because the other accepts the suggestion offered, it seems that the one who made the suggestion has power over the other. It says the "more nervous persons" are the best "subjects" because they are more prone to suggestion. What is the result of the STILL "more nervous kind", but that condition called insanity? Under such mental conditions, no objects appear to the OUTSIDE OBSERVER, which SEEM REAL to their SIGHT OR VISION. Therefore, these, or such like conditions that are prevalent to the insane, are subject to change, if that person or object returns to the normal state of sound thinking. If the insane ideas were true, the reality of their existence would APPEAR TO ALL ALIKE so the proof of their actuality would then remain fixed, or incessant. To-day, we have "healing" thru the practice of Spiritualism, Hypnotism, Mental Science and Christian Science, all of which teach the Power of "Mind over Matter", though the latter two claim "there is no matter". The latter is more practical of any of the three, because it teaches more of God, than is taught by the others as Power, or, that Satan should not be recog-

nized, or, it does not voice and teach as the average Church—Good and Evil. This state of Thought in Consciousness acts just the same as any material application, in that it relieves or stills the Conscious Thought of disease, while the physical is healed or becomes healthy thru its being allowed its natural course of receiving lost energy thru growth on matter necessary to sustain it,—the patient in the meanwhile abstaining from Evil which placed the body in such a state as to take on diseased conditions. In some cases when the Physical has been weakened by too much drugs, the Thought healing can be employed as a reactive agent,—the Physical being better able to build up those parts which have been more or less weakened by drugs. Now, the only fault with all healing agents—Material and Mental—is that they neither teach the real cause of the disease, therefore, treating as in all problems, the result, and so the Cause continues to create disease which is the Effect of that Cause. One teaches “unsanitary conditions as the Cause”, and the other that “disease is only a belief”. So, the people go on and on in living “after the flesh”—sexual indulgence to such an extent, that not only the Physical is weakened, but the Conscience and mind is also weakened. The Truth and teaching Is to “overcome the world” HERE, so man may live more the Spiritual Life, instead of teaching, “Man is Spiritual and not Material,” which will never make him overcome the world here, any more than the other doctrines, for, I have seen, talked, and know many of the followers of this teaching who are not advanced more than others, or, have just as Evil a mind along this line as others. Some fol-

lowers may say "It is not the fault of the teaching, that it is so", but I argue that any teaching is at fault if it cannot change its followers, because the followers cannot be at fault, since, they are only guided by that which is taught them, which is, or they are the Cause and Effect of that teaching. That is just the reason followers of any teaching are lacking, because somewhere, the teaching is lacking. Christian Science affirms that "man is perfect", as it claims "God is perfect", and that "we" continue so as a Spiritual Being, thereby, lessening the ability of the Thought or God to bring about such a state of Being Perfect HERE. Though Jesus said,—“Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect”, it was and is not that God or Thought is Perfect by Manifestation. This sentence simply illustrates that only thru the Highest—Heaven conception of life can man be Perfect, and not that he is at present Perfect, any more than God is Perfect, since, God—Thought cannot be Perfect in the visible, until the visible is Perfect, because nothing exists until it is visible, though the idea may be Perfect in Principle.

We are living, not only in an age of greed and corruption, but of nervousness, and so have reached "the limit", where it is necessary to begin to grow and develop more on an equal basis in all problems of life. It is because of this extreme nervousness that mesmerism, spiritualism and the like are more universal, or more universally used than in the time of Jesus. So, it is time to abandon past beliefs, for, as it says, "the devil knoweth he hath but a short time to live", is significant of the fact that the present day Truth is having its effect on "the

200 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

devil"—evil as it has been working "side by side" with God—Good. The Physical—"Devil" is working along all lines, such as Sanitary law, or that, to not heed such is the real cause of disease. The foolhardy idea of "open window school houses" and the like, and many other false ideas, are just to evade the Truth, since to acknowledge and live the Truth would hinder pleasure in the flesh—and no Kingdom will work against its own Kingdom. "The Devil"—flesh—will not work against its own. To "feed the lambs and sheep" we must abide by the Truth, for, the lambs and sheep are not people, but the Truth and Love of the same that has been "slaughtered" by Error and the love of it. This Truth and love of the same, is "the fold" that man must "enter"—entertain—for thereby he will be "entertaining angels unawares". To "feed" is to UPHOLD the Truth. When confronted by the "damsel", Peter did not uphold the Truth when he said "I know not the man", therefore, he fed or upheld a lie for fear of what might become of Peter if he then told the Truth about knowing Jesus. This lie in the sight of those present would indicate that Peter was not the man and teacher of the Truth which, of course, would lessen the followers of the Truth, and so could not take "me in", or give "me drink" so as to build up the Truth. Jesus was condemned by the Pharisees because "he made himself the Son of God", which was the actual Truth of the Spirit—God—Thought in which he lived, though not the God-like, or the Christ-like ideas as preached then and now by the Church.

In Revelation 1: 10 and 11 it reads,—“I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day, and heard behind me

a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and what thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven Churches which are in Asia: unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamor, and unto Thy-atria, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicia ”.

In giving the interpretation of words taken from Revelation heretofore and hereafter,—these definitions may, at times, seem ridiculous. I will agree with you that some of the interpretations are queer, if you will agree with me also that the same words in Revelation are queer and absurd. Revelation is composed mostly of words which are to be used as symbols of something. St. John was under such a state of visionary seeing, and this accounts for the lucid though queer to the Mortal view of the understanding of Spiritual significance, and their symbolic meaning. He “was in the Spirit ” because he lived very much from the world as Jesus did, which was the reason also that “Jesus loved this disciple ” more than the others, just as one man who drinks liquor, loves to be in company with one who does likewise, more than the company of one who abstains, and VICE VERSA.

The words “Behind me ” signifies that as Paul says,—The natural man “cannot see this form—hear this great voice ”, because it is perceived only thru the Spiritual Sense of Sight—“it is Spiritually discerned ”—which “as a trumpet ” signifies filling space or “everywhere present ”, and not coming FROM HEAVEN or ANY LOCALITY, but IS, for, as it says, “as OF a trumpet ”—the word trumpet is symbolic of signifying volume in ex-

pansion of space, and is "the first and the last" because it is the Universal Law of Truth to be the first and the last, or, "the beginning and ending". The "seven churches" referred to, are symbolic of all and any religious denominations giving out their different views, which may be likened to the "seven" religious denominations given by Geo. Cram in his diagram of the world. These are,—the "Brahmins, Jews, Protestants, Greek Church, Roman Catholics, Mohammedans, and Buddhists, Confusians". The "seven golden candlesticks" represent these religions as giving light to the world in the way of the Truth. It reads,—"the seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches"—religions. We read of their being criticized in chapter two, although it reads,—"For my name's sake hast thou labored, and hast not fainted",—"Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love". "Nevertheless, repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and remove thy candlestick". Here it illustrates each Church sending out "angels"—Thoughts as to Truth, but they have and do fail to bring back good results. The "seven angels which stood before God" are also symbolic of the "seven churches", because they represent the many doctrines—angels—Thoughts of the "One angel". But when the "mighty angel came down from heaven", or the one Angel of Truth, we hear what the seven churches say to-day as in the time of Jesus,—"Crucify him". They hear this mighty angel "with a loud voice as when a lion roareth; and when he had cried, seven thun-

ders uttered their voices", which "seven thunders" symbolize. the NOISE AND UPROAR made by the seven churches—religions—when again, or, to-day the Scientific Truth which is the One Voice of Truth is sounded. But it says,—“SEAL UP THOSE THINGS WHICH THE SEVEN THUNDERS UTTERED, AND WRITE THEM NOT”. Their time is come, because the “little book” is the One Doctrine—Book, and not the doctrines—“MANY BOOKS” that have sounded. “And he said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many people, and nations, and tongues, and kings”. This “prophesy AGAIN”, is significant of the fact that past opinions and beliefs are to be changed, or that the first prophecy as given by Jesus was not understood, so “again”, Science must reveal what the Real Truth is, which is a reasonable God—Thought Sense of understanding. The “reed like unto a rod” symbolizes a faith—“reed”, which is not a faith—“a reed shaken by the wind”—changed at will. A “reed and rod”—the word “rod” symbolizing a faith—“reed”—that will endure, because it is hardened to the test. The “rod” that will endure is able in “the measuring of the temple”, which “measuring” signifies making a distinction between the temple—Word of God, “which temple ye are”, and the temple—Word of Satan, which temple ye are, so long as you manifest the opposite.

Both—Jew and Gentile, are represented as the “two witnesses”, for, “both shall prophesy”, which means that “all nations” shall be alike in their work, and not that Thought favors one more than the other. The “four and twenty elders”

which occupy the "four and twenty seats", is symbolic of the Greek Alphabet. Webster defines characters, or letters as "persons", so I conclude that the character, person and letter are synonyms, as used in Revelation to express the true character and reputation of the word. The Greek Alphabet, therefore, is the twenty-four "elders", because the Alphabet consists of twenty-four characters, namely,—Alpa—"the beginning"—Beta, Yamma, Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, Eta, Theta, Iota, Kappa, Lamda, Mu, Nu, Xi, Omikron, Pi, Rho, Sigma, Tau, Upsilon, Phi, Chi, Psi, and Omega—"the ending"—"beginning and ending". These letters—"elders"—are significant of being "clothed in white" because white is the symbol of purity, so, Thought in such letters—characters—of Truth are "crowns of gold". "The Throne" signifies or represents the Universal Consciousness in individual form—man. So then, the language expressed by the "twenty-four elders"—letters of the Greek Alphabet is the Truth concerning God. "Twenty-four seats" are given here because twenty-four elders are spoken of, which seat or "seats" is the foundation built by these elders. The "four beasts" are symbols of Europe, Africa, Asia and America and their possessions as earthly conditions, since, we cannot conceive of any animals—"beasts full of eyes BEFORE and BEHIND". The "eyes before and behind" are here significant of connections between the different countries—beasts, or that they are related to each other. "The first beast was like a lion", symbolizes Europe, which has represented strength as a beast of power, but like the lion that roars and boasts of its power, this monarch power

cannot live forever, as it says,—“ WAS like a lion ”. The “ second beast like a calf ”, symbolizes Africa, because of its WEAKNESS and subjection to other powers—beasts. The “ third beast had a face as a man ”, symbolizes Asia, because it is generally regarded as the birthplace of the human race—“ man ”—and the most ancient seat of civilization, as well as the locality in which Jesus Christ appeared and did his works. The “ fourth beast was like a flying eagle ”, symbolizes America, because of its being more separate as the wings of an eagle would indicate this, and by this separation it develops independency, which naturally develops a Higher Thought and form of government, and soon becomes recognized by the other powers—beasts—as ABOVE and SUPERIOR to them as “ a flying eagle ” symbolizes this. All “ four beasts ” are referred to as having “ six wings about them ”, which symbolizes protection until the height of peace is really reached on a basis of equality. These wings having “ eyes within ” is significant of the fact that there is no OUTER world—other world—or space, as “ the eyes before and behind ” referred to in the “ four beasts ”—powers, symbolizes all connections of the world or space circumscribed, for, “ the eyes WITHIN ”, indicate no farther sight, since it could not be referred to as a sight. They are all represented as not “ resting day or night ”, because the whole world is a continued body of force and energy continually working, since, Thought and like force need no rest.

In Rev. 13: 18, it reads,—“ Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man, and his

number is six hundred threescore and six". The number of the beast is the same as the man, because they are on an equal footing, or cannot be represented without each other and here, the beast is Evil, and man—the beast part is evil, therefore their number is ALIKE, or, "his number is 666 or equal as will be seen by his number". So "the name of the beast, or number of his name "are many evils", as we read in Mark 5:7. "And he asked him, What is thy name? and he answered, saying, My NAME is legion: for we are many". So "the number of the beast" is "legion"—many evils, and is the number of a man—men, because many live with "the beast". The beast here takes on the form of disease, because beast is Material and Evil is Material—Natural, while the "four beasts" referred to above represents the world, because the world is Material. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord", that is, the life of mortality is become extinct by the resurrection—knowledge of immortality as present instead of future. And THEN, "Satan is bound" by the fact that God is loosed. "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire". That is,—all doctrines as "written in the books" concerning material life and death and the evil thereof, are cast aside, or into the "lake of fire"—burning Truth, because they are not of, nor can they be "written in the book of life". "Books of life" symbolizes MORE THAN ONE Doctrine or Creed, while "Book" is a symbol of One Doctrine—Christ Idea. Again it says,— "And death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man ac-

cording to their works." "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death". The "doctrines written in the books" being "who-soever",—material ideas, are what "death and hell delivered up" when the Truth became known, for it was they—evil doctrines which were in them because they were of them. Note with me, that it does not say "every man" is judged according to HIS WORK, but according to "THEIR WORKS". If the word "every" had not been connected with the word "man", then it might be possible to believe it referred to man that "works", and should be judged accordingly, or to "their works". The word "works" in connection with "their" and the word "Every" in connection with the word "man", cannot be associated together as man who works, or that it is man who works. If it read every man according to his work, it could refer to man directly, as the one who works, but by adding the S to work, and their to works, it signifies that they were judged every man according to their works"—the work of evil, or "their works", making as I have said all along and aim to prove that it is Good and Evil working, and that no man is condemned hereafter for the work of Evil, but is condemned or not according to Evil and Good working. Jesus gives my idea exactly, when he said "every man shall be scattered to HIS own", because it draws out my meaning, or that the remark made here in Revelation cannot refer to you or man directly when it says "every man according to THEIR works". It should be a singular word—"his", instead of the plural word—"their", if it referred to man directly, because the word "every" gives the plural

meaning to the sentence. The work of the Natural Thoughts are known or judged—understood by “their works” to be corrupt, in that the Natural is against the Spiritual, or “the flesh lusteth against the Spirit”, since, the “tree is known by its fruit”. “And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire”, signifies that only THE IDEA of death and hell were cast into the lake of fire”, or, that such ideas cannot forever be called the Truth, but are destroyed when the Truth is known, which is “the lake of fire”, for, “death and hell are NOT THINGS, OR MEN, but the result of Evil and Material conditions. They will be destroyed—abolished, burned by “the lake of fire”, which Truth—Fire is the Spirit that is always burning. In this verse it corroborates my former statement that the Natural belief or worldly condition which IS “death and hell” to man, is the “second death”, for, it says,—“And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH”. I again repeat that it does not refer to man—you,—only in the Sense that he is Conscious of Evil NOW, just as it refers to man—you—as he is conscious of the Truth NOW. In 2nd Cor. 11th chapter, 14th and 15th verses it says, “And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works”.

You will note here that “according to their works”, refers to “ministers”, or men, but the repetition of the word “ministers” in the same sentence makes it clear, that, while the ministers are men, they are “his ministers”, or, showing as

I argue that men—ministers are working according to HIS works—Satan—"the angel of light", and not according to the ministers as men, or "their works". Here again, "their works" can be applied to men, but not in the same meaning as "their works" quoted from Revelation. It is properly used here, because it uses the word ministers properly, or it does not read "every minister according to their works", or as using the plural meaning twice, when it should be used but once, as every minister according to HIS works, and not "every man according to their works".

In Revelation where it speaks of "the souls of them that were slain", it signifies the Spiritual Senses of life embodied by man, which are continually working, but has been and is "slain"—not understood. Both—the Natural and Spiritual Senses—Souls—are working to THEIR OWN END, but the END of the Natural Senses or Souls is prophesied which is "death", while the END of the Spiritual Senses or Souls "IS life everlasting". The Natural Soul or Sense is Natural thinking, while the Spiritual SOUL or SENSE is Spiritual thinking, and as it says: these Spiritual Senses—Souls HAVE BEEN "slain"—MISUNDERSTOOD "for the word of God", but are now UNDERSTOOD—"alive forevermore". "The souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus", are the same Senses that have been "beheaded"—slain or not understood "since the foundation of the world", but are now understood thru the destructive principles of the Natural Senses, which same are the diseased and death conditions of man. All Natural Senses of appetite

shall be destroyed, which are destroying the character and health of man. The smoke emerging from "the bottomless pit" is significant of the result of the destruction of the Natural Sense, because it has no foundation in fact, therefore, "bottomless", while "the sun and the air" signifies the Spiritual—Eternal Light and Life, since, Sun and Air represent life. These Spiritual Senses of man "were darkened by reason of the smoke"—Natural being consumed, which were "of the pit". In this Natural Sense of Life, "there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth",—that is, Natural Thoughts of the One Evil is represented by the form of "Locusts" in all forms of Life.

It speaks of the "twelve tribes" being saved, and of "twelve foundations",—but Paul says,—“For other foundation can no man lay than which IS LAID, which is Jesus Christ”. Let us turn here, or away from the quotations taken from Revelation for a minute, to some other quotations given, and their definitions which may have more to bear on the quotation from Revelation.

Jesus and the Apostles were the teachers and preachers of the Truth aimed at by the former. But it is plausible that some partiality was shown, as it seems to be natural (It is only natural, or not Spiritual), with all nations, or nationalities on any subject. Throughout all their preaching, some distinction is made between the Jew and Gentile, which is not in DIRECT ACCORDANCE with the law of any Truth and Error, therefore not according to "Good and Evil"—God and Satan. In my opinion, how truly was Jesus rebuked in his Conscience by this Universal law of Truth as we read in Matthew

15: 24 to 28. "But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel". "Then came she and worshiped him, saying, Lord, help me! "But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast IT to dogs." "And she said, Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat the crumbs which fall from their masters' table." "Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith." The general sentiment of the people seems to be that Jesus was to test the "faith" of the woman by refusing to listen to her entreaty. But the above and last remark made by the woman simply illustrates the partiality shown by Jesus and all men generally, since, as Paul finally admits "God is no respecter of persons". She should not be considered only as equal to "dogs", which is the tone here in which Jesus and his followers beheld the Gentiles. This is also the reason why people have been led to believe that they are forever to be servants, and so continue to eat "the crumbs which fall from their masters' table", in the way of small earnings, when they are the source thru which most of the earnings have been made, and that there should be no "masters" and "servants" when the true brotherhood of man shall be known and lived. This is not the first time Jesus had to say "Not my will but thine be done", which again proves to me that "Truth will out", or that it is the work of Truth in us to destroy the work of Error in us—we are only the tools in the hand of either. Emerson says,—“Jesus would absorb the race: but Tom Paine, or the coarsest blasphemer

212 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

helps humanity by resisting this exuberant of power”.

So then, there can be only “one foundation” as argued by Paul, and not “twelve” as referred to in Revelation. But, the twelve are SEEN and given by St. John, because of the twelve apostles teaching—working on the same or one foundation that Jesus Christ laid, but not Jesus, though Jesus is mentioned because all work is done thru man. “The city lieth four square and the length is as large as the breadth”,—which is symbolic of the Truth of Spiritual Life as always the same, in principle, and a Spiritual Creation, “whose builder and maker is God”. It has “a wall great and high that no man can build”, which symbolizes that it is not a material structure, therefore, the Truth of Spiritual Life built by Thought or God, and signifies the end of mortality. “And he measured the city with the reed twelve thousand furlongs, the length, and the breadth and the height are equal”, which, if taken metaphorically, or as referring to anything but Spiritual Life in the form of Creation, would be absurd, since, man could not build, nor even measure such a wall or live under such conditions. This simply illustrates that God or Spiritual Life cannot BE REACHED, BUILT OR MEASURED by the Natural Idea of Life, but is built by the Spiritual understanding and Idea—Christ of life which is ABOVE the Material conception of Life. “And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits”, which “wall” symbolizes man built after, or upon the foundation of Christ. We have learned that the “FOUNDATION” is the Teaching of Truth in the form of Spiritual Life,

therefore, "the wall"—MAN built upon this Foundation—Principle, must refer to the Spiritual Idea—Christ of man in "the Image of God"—Thought. This you must agree with, when reading the latter part of the sentence which reads,—“according to the measure of a man, that is of the angel”,—which again, if taken metaphorically would be absurd, since we cannot conceive of any man reaching such a height as “A hundred and forty and four cubits”. It reads, “the measure of a man”, and not a city and man, and continues by adding, “THAT IS, of the angel”,—signifying, man is to reach the Highest Conception of life thru God as Thought—“the Angel”.

We read in Matthew 22:41 to 46,—“While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, “Saying, what think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?” “They say unto him, the Son of David, “He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? “If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? “And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any Man, from that day forth, ask any more questions”. These few verses contain the Whole Letter of the Christ, which is the Spirit, the word, and the Truth of Life. The correct interpretation will disclose the fact that Christ is no Eternal connection to Jesus, with Jesus, and so, not the Son of David as Jesus here cites, although Jesus was the offspring—lineage of David after the form and continued law of the Natural Creation. In answering the questions put to them by Jesus, “They say unto him, the Son of David”,

but, David in Spirit, called Christ or God, "My Lord", therefore, Christ could not be the Son of David, as Jesus says, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?" IT illustrates that when David looked above and away from the Natural and Temporal conception of life, or "David in Spirit", to the Spiritual and Eternal conception of Life, he beheld Christ—"my Lord"—which Christ is God, because "I and my Father are ONE".

We read in Matthew 24: 22, "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved, but for the elects' sake those days shall be shortened". This plainly tells of the MAN OF TO-DAY, which shall not be the MAN OF TOMORROW, or that there is no escaping the Evolution of Thought and Man, any more than man could escape the Evolution of Natural formation, and ask the foolish question, "What am I here for, or Why am I here", when he is here because he cannot escape existing conditions. "The elects' sake" signifies Evolution, and, as Emerson says: "If John was perfect, why are you and I alive?" Paul says, "without us", or, as we appear to-day,—flesh and Spirit—"the elects" could not reach the height of Perfection, or, if Man could reach the height of Perfection without flesh, "there should no flesh be saved."

Paul says, "For the law of the Spirit of Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of Sin and death", AS MUCH AS I AM ABLE TO ABIDE BY THAT LAW. In other words, Paul received the law relating to the Spiritual life and so was not under the belief of the law of sin and death. He simply received and acknowledged the law of

Truth—"new law"—but because of living under "the law of sin and death"—"old law"—before the understanding of the new law CAME TO HIM as it must come to ALL, he was in part subject (all men are and will be until the old law is entirely abolished—destroyed), to the old law, from the very fact that that part of life lived under the Natural Law, was, and is still Material. We are not entirely free from all worldly Thoughts—old law—and conditions at this period, neither indeed can be, under the present existence, but it is OUR WORK thru the Work of Thought in the form of Truth—new law—to destroy the old law of "sin and death". We have worshipped Jesus and the like, but we find as he says, "there is no good in me". In Revelation, it says, "Worship thou God", and not Jesus, for, "I am thy fellow servant also, "worship thou not me".

The word Christian is derived from the word Christ, therefore, to be a Christian, one should really Manifest and live the Christ life only. But, we have looked up to Jesus and others generally who aim to hold themselves equal to him, that we have failed to live the Christ life he taught. We call ourselves Christians and some others we call Infidels and Heathen, when there is not one of us—Christian, Heathen or Infidel who has lived up to the Christ and so cannot be Christian, but in NAME only. So, there is not a Christian to-day, in fact, we could not live such a life under the present conditions. Jesus only revealed the Christ, and therefore the Christian Idea of life, for, he did not live it, neither could he, because it was impossible then, as it is even now impossible to live the Christ Idea

in its True Sense or Soul of an existence complete. Jesus was "the man of sorrows", because he looked at others living in happiness to a certain extent under a law he was not teaching, and because it was no more than Natural for them to do so. The same are changed only thru the Evolution of Thought, and by the embodiment of more of this Thought or God, is one man more able to live the Higher life than another. I have proved and demonstrated this beyond all doubt. So, I am not under bond entirely to the World—Natural, and am free from "the law of sin and death" because I now uphold the law of life only, instead of both—life and death. But, we are living in a more Spiritual or Mental state of existence than heretofore, since, the Mental is outgrowing the Physical in different walks or problems of life. The cry goes out by some who seem to think the sexual conditions and other problems are worse, but this is not true only in their proportions and growth. It is only because the same is more openly and brought to light to-day, while in the past it has been more in secret, that it seems to those who have not observed the situation that it is worse.

It was not until the latter years of Paul's life that he was able to say, "I would that all men were even as I myself", and "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I". Jesus and Paul had not lived without this desire and experience, when we consider the conditions of their time, for, it was so much more Natural—Animal—than in the present. Paul's remark,—“He was in all points tempted like as we”, is significant to the fact that Jesus at

some time had yielded, for, in no other way is it possible for man to know the result of opposites unless he can experience both. If the people believed on him as being supernatural, and do believe on him as being such, this is not proof that such was and is the case, since, no man is able to know the exact life of another, especially in such private matters as these. Besides, it would be absurd to use the word "fast" in connection with the life of Jesus, or any other person, if he or that person had not been tempted and yielded. The word "fast" would lose its significance if you did not ABSTAIN from doing or using that which you were in the HABIT of doing or using. So, the animal—flesh—or brute nature still predominates in some, much more than in others.

The subject of Killing may be of interest here, because it deals with the life of man, and to point out a few features here because it is the growing conversation to-day that these wars should cease, which is proof that the Higher Thought of life is developing in us. As long as men kill each other, as in war, just that long will the animal nature be with him in another Sense, as Richard said,—“My soul and body on the action both”. It is the nature of one animal to kill another. It is generally so that one animal and things, thrives on another animal and things. Man kills man,—not because it is the way to correct a wrong, as the agitators of war would have us believe and so keep us in ignorance, but because it is the brute and selfish nature in him. Neither is the man who kills animals, a fit example to teach a Higher life, because he has a certain amount of killing instinct in him,

218 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

which, of course, as stated heretofore, is due to the Old Testament theory, that God ordered it thus. We can say God ordered it so, because man believes it is so, and not because a God ordered it so, yet, such a Thought—God is authority because such conditions of Thought exist. When man becomes Higher in Thought, he will crave less the animal food to serve his appetite. As the generations pass, he will not kill the animal for food and clothing, because there will be thru development and invention a way by which he can replace the animal for food and clothing. I cannot say here with some writers that Meat, or anything we eat has any direct cause as lessening our proficiency in learning and as to our health, but, that a desire or a giving up these appetites will allow a Higher Sense of perception to develop in us. When we lose the Sense of appetite for meat, we lose the Sense of destruction to the greater existence of life, and thereby are we able to better conditions in all problems of life. So too, if man develops a Higher Sense in Thought, it follows that the animal will develop accordingly, though not of themselves or Thought of themselves, or that animals have a Mind as some authorities claim. The wild flower develops to a more beautiful one thru the man training it, or, as to a Higher Sense of beauty but not because the flower has a Higher Sense of existence,—and so the animal develops Higher thru the developing and Higher State of existence of man as man above the brute. The offspring of the animal inherit like habits and improve sometimes thru the habits of its progenitors. We do things sometimes where no Thought and Conscience is required, just as the ani-

mal goes about doing things sometimes that would seem to require a Conscience, but is done thru habit—the thing being repeated until a habit is formed. If you let yourself go and do, with no thought of where you are going, and as to doing, at the time you are on the way there and doing, you will go where and do what you have been in the habit of going and doing, and not where you may have started out to go and do. In other words, we are not conscious of what we are doing at all times, so we, like the animal—no Conscience—do things thru habit. A person who has received a severe blow about the head, thereby affecting the Conscience and Thought have been known to return to the primitive state of man—having no Thought, recollection or Sense of anything, yet, retaining the Sense of Hearing, Tasting, Smelling, Seeing, Touching and Thirsting which belongs to the animal,—and even acting in like manner as the animal. All Senses are used, but the Sense of Life in Reason and the Higher and Lower Sense of life. Animals do not have a Sense of Right and Wrong, but are taught so by man to know the difference thru treating them kindly and unkindly, or by not whipping and whipping them. You have witnessed the performance of “trained” animals, and it seems to your observation that the animals have a conception of that or this, and know which is which by what you term a thinking of that or this. But the trainer will tell you it is by constant and repeated doing of the same “trick”, and the repetition of the same sign of each trick, that produces the impression on the brain so that by a formed habit the animal is able to do the trick. By giving them “a

piece of sugar", or in case with a sea-lion—a fish is given, will prompt them to do a thing so unnatural to their natural—brute life. I have drawn somewhat away from the "Christian" subject here, but it has been in part to show how un-Christian the animal nature is, and why we are very like the animal, and should only receive credit the same, but aim to call ourselves Christians.

I read an article in a newspaper recently, telling of "Christians in Russia killing the Jews". This is really amusing, when we consider the inconsistency of the same, or that it is and should be characteristic of a Christian to be dealing in death blows. It is only Characteristic of Barbarians or Cannibals to kill, yet, we uphold and kill each other, and cry "Christian" as applied to ourselves, while we cry "heathen" and also try to Christianize them. Could you imagine anything so absurd as Jesus Christ in the act of murdering? We call war and the gain it renders, a duty and legitimate, but it is murder and robbery, pure and simple. It is excused "under the flag" which it sails, and so we continue to do business so long as we—the class in political power, can make the people and the one not in power believe it is to their benefit. But the people are beginning to "wake up" to the fact that only the former are benefited by what the latter do, and they—the latter do all the killing. The latter have found out also that this is un-Christian, and so, are the first to line up as the true teachers of Christianity as upheld by Jesus Christ. They have not so many followers at present, but we must be content, since we know Jesus had few followers. You have stood by and watched some one

sic a dog on to another dog,—well,—it is the same case in war—the two dogs suffer, while the “sicker” reaps the benefit. What an outrage is this war on the different nations! It is not only selfish, but Barbarian, and the nation making the attack, should be looked upon as are individuals. For an example,—when John meets Jack, and John has an idea that he wants a certain thing, or a piece of property belonging to Jack, or they dispute over some private affair which in no way ought really to concern him, then John pulls a revolver and kills Jack. The next morning the headline of a newspaper reads “An awful murder”, and tells in one or more columns of the “terrible tragedy over a trivial affair”. People read and talk over this ONE MAN being killed, and the “awful news and deprivation it must be to his family”, while they SHOUT AND GLORY (if it is as they think it ought to be, or it is their side that wins) over the headlines in the same newspaper telling of the victories won in war. The same causes the death of THOUSANDS over just as trivial a matter and selfish things as were between John and Jack, and they never pay any attention to the “AWFUL” news it must mean to these thousands of families who must suffer because of the loss of so many. Then too, in the case with John and Jack—the former is arrested and condemned for his act, while the victor in war who is on the same plane as John, is applauded, and great “feasts” are held in the HONOR of such, when it and they should be condemned. I think too, that if an American goes to a foreign country, or if a foreigner comes to this country, and by some chance is condemned and put to death, that we

222 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

should not take it upon ourselves nor they upon themselves, to call a war and kill thousands for the life of one. This I do not call "fighting for our rights", since, that person is out of his jurisdiction as to his "own country", and should be an object and subject to that country he resides in, and really can only be subject to its laws.

We had better stop propagation at once, and thereby save the trouble and expense to a family, if we are only to send the increase to be slain in war. I can understand why our "ex-president" believes in large families. Such an expression of thought can only come from the foundation of murder. I mean by this, that those who believe in and uphold war and kill, not only men, but animals and the like, could not be expected to hold any other or higher view, since, large families of people and all animal life are necessary in order to fulfil such a belief and desire to kill. It is not to infer that our "ex-president" cannot hold any higher view of life, but the fact that to hold the idea of destruction can only spring from such a source of that but propagation, and that such are not really capable of solving the real problem of a greater, or that which shall produce and lead a greater life.

I argue that it is really a crime, and so is a real sin for the parent to bring into the world any more of their like than they are able to support. And "support" in this generation does not mean—like the animal—ONLY AN EXISTENCE as many are obtaining to-day. It means a thorough education in all which tends to build up Soul and body. If the ignorant people will only become wise to the fact that they are the only ones to be slain and

also the losers in case of war, while the ones at the head—the few—never lose but gain thru the loss of life of others, they will not rally to this fighting and killing their own. Reform and Right cannot be brought about by war. So it is easy for me to sit in office and tell others what to do, especially, if I have no part in the disaster, and really reap the reward that others really won thru death in war. Is it not time in which the people shall not be governed by the few, since the people are they who have done the fighting for freedom? It is the multitude that win in war also, yet, the few have positions that are generally safe, and yet, they generally receive the credit for victories won. What Hypocrisy! in the name of God, as it is given out to the troops by the Rulers that it is so, when it is for their own selfish gain. Jesus said "Woe unto you also, ye lawyers: for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burden with one of your fingers". Does this remark not illustrate the fact that the time is near at hand when the few making the laws for the man, who shall obey what these few wish, are to be put to route? How true this is of the law makers generally. They make such laws to suit themselves, or Sunday laws,—but were THEY compelled to fill them, they would not "be able to bear them". In other words, they are men of leisure, as their office has no restriction over time generally, and with plenty of time OUTSIDE of Sunday, for all kinds of amusements and the like; the laws which they make for Sunday, trouble them not. These same persons would not "touch the burden" with their own hands, which they throw upon the shoulders

of others. They, as did the Pharisees, may do other things on Sunday which would be less in keeping with, and contrary to the Spirit of God. Think of the graft that most of them plot during the week, and then make PRETENSE of obeying the Truth by going to Church on Sunday. No wonder Jesus was compelled to talk outside of the Church, or to "THE MULTITUDES" instead of THE FEW, He illustrated this by saying: "A rich man can hardly enter the kingdom of heaven"—that is, A man looking only to money as his God, cannot entertain the Spirit of a better and Higher life. Those who have tried to satisfy themselves with the general principle of religious beliefs are awakening to the fact that such is not furnishing positive proof as to its Truth, because of an unsatisfied generation which is so prevalent. To-day, as of old, there is too much stress put upon what I call "Theoretical religion". The true spirit is not to condemn your brother for what SEEMS to you an evil, while in YOUR OWN HEART there lies as many faults that are REALLY EVILS. The only evils then to condemn, whether it be on Sunday or a week day, are those which interfere with the homes and happiness of others, as we read in Exodus 21:17. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor anything that is thy neighbors". THESE THINGS, are wrong at any time, but, as Jesus says,—“To eat with unwashed hands defileth not the man”, for IT IS ONLY A CUSTOM, which is followed to-day more than the Truth. If you deny a man his rights, by shutting him off from innocent amusements, you

are only seeing to it, that he lives up to YOUR LAWS, instead of the laws of Truth. We should be allowed to open any legitimate business, (any other ought to be closed ALL THE TIME, but because those who are not able to overcome certain things they are open, and should, in this case, be open), or attend any respectable entertainment when we feel so disposed to do so, and should there be any disturbance among the spectators, we have officers who should look after them. But because of a few that would make trouble ANY TIME AND PLACE, it should not be considered that those of a peaceful mind should suffer. But, here it is again, the majority must suffer for the work of the few, as in law making and the like.

We make certain Sunday laws because the ancient writers HAD A VISION, or more properly speaking, an insane idea that God "worked six days and rested on the seventh", and, of course, if God worked only six, it must be a sin for man to work seven days. But we find Nature and Growth is a continued work in the form of Evolution until all Creation was formed, and then, a continuation of this form of Growth. Nature works while man sometimes sleeps his life away. It is with rest and sleep like many other things in the world of Progress, for, as man becomes more Spiritual in the Highest Sense of Thought, he can do with less sleep, since, sleep is characteristic of the animal or brute nature. In other words, the Physical and its work require more sleep than the Mental and its work. The Spiritual or Mental characteristic is illustrated in the remark made by Jesus to the disciples,— "What: will ye not watch with me one hour?" If

they had been as Spiritual as Jesus, they too, would have been awake with him. One believing more in nature will require more sleep because he believes and gives up more to nature.

There is a vast difference in the word "rest" as contained in Genesis, and the "rest" of the New Testament, as to how it is used. In Matthew 11: 28, 29 and 30, it reads—"Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. "Take my yoke upon you: and learn of me: for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. "For my yoke IS EASY and my burden is light". The "yoke" here illustrates how much lighter a burden is to a person understanding the way to overcome all things of the world. In Genesis 22,—we are taught to believe God worked six, and then rested on the seventh day, but it follows in the same chapter 2-5, that "God made every plant before it grew",—showing that the writer knew nothing of what he was writing, or, that he was always "at sea"—tossed about by this or that belief, which illustrates ignorance as will be observed by the two very different and contrary ideas.

There remains no doubt in my mind but what man requires a certain amount of rest from labor,—this is natural because we are more or less natural by the more or less physical work we do. But, this is not necessarily so with the Mental, nor with Thought, since, we know these are in a working state in one form of work during the physical relaxation or sleep. But the "rest" from labor is not the rest to which Jesus refers. He referred to that rest of "Your souls"—Senses, which each in-

dividual experiences as unrest thru the Senses and work of mortality, or Senses or Souls of Evil in the different form of Evil. It was not the individuals as Souls, or as a Soul for each individual, but the Souls—Senses of each individual by expression, and that the body suffers accordingly. The Senses of the different appetites are to be appeased by its opposite Senses—the Senses of that which will replace these appetites with something better. It is Selfish Senses—Souls that shall be put to rest by replacing each Selfish Sense with an act superior to it in the form of doing something not selfish.

So then, we find that only in a few instances did Jesus refer to the Sabbath, and then, not that it should be observed as a day of “rest”, because it was not to be considered as having any great bearing on what he wished to impress in regard to Truth. But he mentioned it enough to illustrate that IT IS RIGHT TO DO RIGHT, and WRONG TO DO WRONG, SEVEN DAYS IN A WEEK, or, regardless of time and days. The Pharisees then as now could and cannot submit to a Good act if it were and is done on a Sunday—Sabbath. Then too, we have Religions based on Saturday as a Sabbath, and, of course, like everything else in Religion it is overlooked with the idea that if we observe “one day out of a week”, we are excusable. What Reason! for men who call themselves “brainy”. No matter what you do, whether it be right or wrong,—if you observe one day out of a week, you are living a true Christian life—so says poor Christianity. Many times thruout the teaching of Jesus, we find utter contempt by the

228 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

Pharisees for him, because he did Good on Sunday, or illustrated the fact that an evil was an evil any time, and Good was Good at any time. But it was not their OPINION of Good, or rather, it did not permit them of doing evil, that it pierced their heart as Truth always hurts. Jesus said "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath", which is significant that man is not subject—controled by the day—Sabbath, but has control of the day, or that the Sabbath shall be used to his own discretion and will, even if it be to do good or to do evil. It is not so much the day, but rather to "serve the Lord day and night"—do that which is called good seven days, or continually. You claim it is wrong to steal (we can all agree on that), therefore, it being wrong, one is just as liable ONE DAY AS ANOTHER. If you claim it is right to play ball, or to attend a Theatre, or to open a store and do business, it could not come under the heading of that which is wrong, by that very assertion. Jesus said precisely the same meaning when he said,—“Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you ONE THING: Is it lawful on the Sabbath days TO DO GOOD OR TO DO EVIL?” What need we of any further argument? Could you ask for a better explanation than this? So then, we are more apt to make laws to suit ourselves, rather than that which pertains to how shall we reach the state of Spirituality, which is nothing but a state of Higher Mentality. We each seem to have a law of our own in regard to what is right and wrong. One says,—I do not believe in card playing, but dancing is all right and good. Another says,—Card playing is proper and good, but danc-

ing is an evil? Who is right? In regard to what is right and wrong, both cannot be right, nor wrong. Therefore, both are opinions and these opinions cannot be associated with either, right and wrong as an act, since there is no good and evil connected with them. It is then, the Good and Evil Thought you may entertain against or for the ones whom you associate with at either, which work for Good or for Evil to those with whom you come in contact, and this may chance to be on one day or another. You need not be at a card party, nor at a dance, in order to have these Sense of feelings. What a pretty state of affairs it would be if the card players were in the majority, and made the law to that effect. It would be a crime and the same unrest of the Senses—souls, to think that the dancers would have to play cards against their will or not amuse themselves at all if card playing became a law as to the only amusement. Now, there are just as foolish and absurd laws as these that are made to-day, and even enforced. You and I have talked with such narrow people. They tell you what they would do if they had the power. So, why condemn ball playing and the like, and those who attend it on Sunday, if it is right at other times? No wonder Jesus said,—“O generation of vipers: how can ye, being evil speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh”. Here we find that it is not the business that a man is in, not the amusement he wishes to do, that are contrary to that which is good, and therefore an evil and a wrong, nor does it concern the day in which they are practiced. It is the evil thoughts which are contrary to the law of God—Good Thought and

you may have these, and are just as subject to them, whether it be in your own home, or at the ball game (more liable at the former place, because evil suggestions are not at the latter, neither could they act there), and at all times or days alike.

I am thankful to have Sunday, or even one day in a week as a day of leisure, and a day free from all business cares,—but; and if I wish to attend a ball game, a Theatre, or TAKE A BATH, I should be allowed that liberty. It is mine—this liberty, so long as I cause no trouble in the way of intruding on another's property. This is the only evil that can be answered for by one man to another, or where a law should be made to answer, for, and therefore concerns God and man. Nature alone deals with the physical works, and if we are overworked, we are working against Nature. Any kind of labor should not be overtaxed, yet, the very people who generally stand at the head of law and make these laws, are they, who generally overtax their help on Sunday as well as other days. Should I be condemned and fined if I fail to satisfy a law that is ONE MAN MADE, or is suggested by one, and then voted on by a privileged few? One man said "We have got to make laws and look out for these people"—referring to those He called "ignorant and sinful". He is a man in business, and one who is not at all times honest in his business methods, yet, he would be willing to look after the "other fellow". It seems absurd to attempt to Christianize a people by taking away what seems right to them, so long as they do you no injury, while you use your rights that are wrong to them.

It is only because one or the other is in the majority that they use their RIGHTS WRONG.

"But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that this it must be". That is, no form of life can exist than what is characteristic with the times in which it exists, and all mortality which is a form of selfishness in different forms of life must be "FULFILLED"—ENDED, before immortality can be reached. This has been and is "the law of the prophets". Prophecy is made under the conditions which exist, and that which may in time exist, since, Man, or a prophet can look back and see the advanced change made from one generation to another, and by so doing he is able to prophesy greater things for the future. These "Christians" under the different names in Religion you will note are not proving their worth in the name of God, but are causing many deaths, for, it says, "They that kill and do these things think they do God service". So then, it is not Religion, but Science that is changing us from worse to better, yet Religion has had and will have its part in that no great Truths have been reached without many views being assessor to the fact. The different views in Religion are but the result of Thought development derived from many thoughts, the person holding this view having associated himself with the different environments. If I have criticized any Religion, it is not that I am criticizing that person or judging that person who holds that religious view. That person is only subject to what he thinks as a religious view and should not be condemned for what he believes, since, you may have believed the same, and would have believed the same, if your

232 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

environments and associates had been the same. "I judge no man", illustrates the fact that no man should be held up to ridicule for that which he believes and is therefore subject to. We are changing, not because of ourselves, but because the law of growth in Progress demands a change. If I have changed, and here express my view as different and seeming by some to be radical and "advanced", it is not because of my own individual view, but because I have associated myself with the different views and out of these has the Thought formed my opinion in that all thought is formed by different Phenomena. The Jews in the time of Jesus Christ were not so blind, and even believed in Jesus as the teacher of Truth, but were more or less guided by the fear they held of the other nations if they upheld the teaching. The same element is crucifying, or trying to destroy the same Truth to-day, because it interferes with their religious teaching. It is because the Truth could not then be understood and lived, that the "second coming" was a prophecy Jesus made in regard to it. The same religious teaching then and now caused the Jews to say,—“If we believe in this fellow, the Romans will come and take our kingdom from us”. The “CHIEF PRIESTS” said “CRUCIFY HIM”. Evidently, the same feeling exists to-day in Russia by the killing of the Jews by “CHRISTIANS”. This reminds me of an article I recently read in the “Philistine”, saying,—“Exactly the condition that existed in Spain when Torquemada gave all Jews thirty days to join the Catholic Church or leave the country. When he saw that *MANY WERE LEAVING THE COUNTRY*, he fell upon

them, and the gutters of Granada ran ankle deep in human blood. This, in a degree, stopped the emigration, and thousands of people, to *SAVE THEIR LIVES WERE FORCED INTO HYPOCRISY* and mental servitude". The italics are mine, as I wish to impress the right idea, or that the Jews did not wish to be "forced" into this belief and slavery—slavery because of the money extortions and a Religion opposed by Jesus Christ and themselves, but rather than be murdered and in hope some day to free themselves, they in part consented. This kind of money extortion is but to gain financial power, and was all that was to be desired of the Jews, as the quotation will prove, and not that they LOVED the Jews or any one else as a people. We will have to confess some day that no other nationality are so liberal in their help towards mankind—their own especially, which is no more than natural—than the Jews. This is the commandment "to love your neighbor as yourself". They avoid war if possible, and yet, they are looked upon by some, as heathens, and are dealt with accordingly. The tramp,—the habitual drunkard,—the thief, and in fact other offensive characters of this kind are little known by them, while there are thousands found among other nationalities—Christians, if you like. Though they are not CALLED and considered a Christian people IN NAME, yet, they are more Christian in act, and that fulfills the commandment. How beautiful Shakespeare gives an account of them being even better than a Christian by the following words which he puts in the mouth of Shylock:

"I am a Jew: Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a

Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses (Souls), affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian? If you prick us do we not bleed? if you tickle us, do we not laugh? if you poison us, do we not die? and if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that,—If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by a Christian's example? Why revenge—The villany you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard, but I will better the instruction." Note this last remark,—“I will better the instruction”, or “villainy you teach me”, though “it shall go hard”, or “work against the grain” of, or with the Jew to respect the Christian when he is chastised by the Christian—quite a sacrifice for the Jews to make, or, for any nationality when one is opposed to the other. The trouble in Russia against the Jew is nothing but his Religion, though it is reported generally that it is the business methods and cheating exercised by the Jews. We hear a great deal said about the “dishonesty” of the Jews (You and I have been cheated more by our own nationality), but if you will look into our own business dealings, you will find there much more dishonesty, especially in the form of graft and trickery—the worst form of dishonesty, since it does not meet you face to face—than you can account for among your dealings with the Jews, which are open for your inspection always. I remember of a friend saying to a Rabbi,—“Your people seem

all right in a way, but they are so dishonest," at which the Rabbi replied,—“Show me a person who is honest in any nation, and I will kiss him.” This *last* expression—“kiss him”—smacks of more love than could be expressed in the Gentile for the Jew. Besides, I wish to mention the fact here that this same “friend” asking the question has been known by the writer to be “dishonest”, therefore, why should he ask and expect the Jew to be honest?

We are beginning to realize the fact that the word Christian, and the laws—especially Sunday laws are hardly in acquisition to the laws which treat of Spiritual growth, but really have a tendency to dwarf the same. Laws are continually being made to cover every atom of an existence so that man will in time if they are not stopped, be bound so that he can no more connect himself with liberty, than he can connect himself with Christianity. Many laws are made for the purpose of gaining an office for the laws made, and not that there lies in the heart of the man who suggests that or this—that he is working for the benefit of man. “He has an ax to grind”. I have just read that in Kansas there is a law to “tax bachelors”. If I am a bachelor, I would say such a law is not only a damnable outrage, but is too absurd for consideration, and of a necessity, unconstitutional. To think of trying to force a man into marriage whether he is able to support a woman or not, is not only absurd, but is AGAINST A PRIVILEGE THAT SHOULD CONCERN NO ONE BUT HIMSELF. There are plenty of men who would be glad to marry if they could support a woman as she wants to be supported, and as he would like to support her, which

236 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

is impossible in most cases under the present conditions, and which conditions are generally made by that class of illy brains that propose such laws, since, it is not so much against the fact that he is a bachelor, but because they are working for the money end of it. It is just as illegitimate to gain money for yourself and state by such laws as it is for a corporation to fleece money out of its employees. The man is not always at fault in regard to marriage, since it requires TWO PERSONS in anything to make a bargain,—an understanding you should have and not overlook, if you had half the brains allowed one. Woman is just as much to blame for the unmarriageable condition as man, and even more so in the present generation, because they are becoming more independent of man. Men who make and suggest such laws ought to be considered among the “incompetents”, for, they are too “narrow” to argue on a subject of vital importance. There are many of both sexes who should not marry, even if they wish to, or are forced to it by such laws in case they do not care to pay a fine, for the reason that they are unfit for propagation, and ought not to marry, and would you force such to pay a fine? Many generations of families are dying out, and should be let to die out before they put upon the market as we see it to-day—goods unmarketable, and so should not be let to run their full course. This tax, for selfish gain, and it is for nothing else, reminds me of the “city clerk” who some years ago said it was right to raise the dog tax from one to a dollar and a half. So, he invented a metal tag costing about five dollars a hundred. For each one, and writing out the dog

license he received the additional half dollar over and above his salary. A nice income for himself and the clerks to follow, and well worth the time to make such a law that the poor "always have with them". This is just one instance of the laws that are made for the benefit of those who make them. So I say we are getting "LAWED TO DEATH" because there are so many IDLE BRAINS to make and hold the offices they create. This law of marriage is even against the truth of life as is taught by Jesus and Paul as was said "IF YE ARE ABLE TO RECEIVE IT"—"OVERCOME THE WORLD"—you should be exempt from such a law. Priests do not marry, and their religious view should not exempt them from a law made, any more than any other view. Paul said "It is well not to marry. But, if ye cannot contain, it is better to marry, for it is better to marry than to burn." The Priests go free and are respected because of Religion, though as Spencer says,—“Volumes might be written upon the impiety of the pious”. Every person should be allowed to live according to the dictations of HIS OWN CONSCIENCE, when it concerns his own private affairs as in marriage and Religion. When a man tells me whether I shall marry or not, he certainly, ABOVE ALL THINGS, is trying to manage my PRIVATE AFFAIRS, for, that REALLY concerns me, and most of all, MY CONSCIENCE, which latter I MUST and shall be controled by, else, there would be no "rest for my soul"—Sense. This is the "rest" Jesus referred to, and not "the rest in sleep". These very people calling themselves "Christians" are so IN NAME ONLY, but they will meet their

fate sooner or later. Their own swords will turn on them, also, will the people, for, the people will not be forever ordered about by the few law makers as in olden and even the present times, and commanded to obey laws unreasonable. But again, such a method of gaining freedom by the sword is not the one which will bring freedom and equality. And, if I belong to the less fortunate, "I find no good in me" but am under bond to live according to the conditions that exist, which is an age of greed for gain, and so, must develop along with those more fortunate until the age when all are on more equal terms with themselves. But we must not forget that the same greed for gain lies within all of us, if we but had the opportunity, and remember, that a good heart lies within a wealthy human as in one not so wealthy.

We all dislike anarchy, but we are really breeding anarchists, therefore, we should lessen in ourselves that which produces them. We ought not to complain of a thing we breed, but rather stop the process of breeding. You may have a kind dog, but if you continually kick him, do not object if the poor ignorant animal turns upon and bites you. This is his only method of defense, just as it is with the ignorant and poor worker who is being kicked about and "lawed" against more than his keeper. Rather give the dog and him credit for having more sense of feeling than yourself, since, you, being "wise", caused the anger which produced the bite. So, you must abolish laws that are anarchistic, if you wish to abolish anarchy, or abolish the cause of anarchy, if you wish to destroy anarchists. So this law against bachelors in mak-

ing them pay a fine, is not Christian. The law of nature is even against the law of God, because Thought is against the flesh, and, "the flesh is against the Spirit". Jesus Christ made this "Revelation" which seems so complicated in the verse of St. John. You claim to teach Jesus Christ as YOUR doctrine, yet, you make laws against this Revelation and Knowledge which is to be Resurrected—Acknowledged. Paul says, "I would have all men even as myself", which signifies "the bachelor". How are you going to get around THIS LAW, laid down by Jesus Christ, and enforce your law of marriage? This is the True Revelation of the Truth, and when it is known as it shall be known, we will not say in the words of Pilate—"What is Truth?"

There has been and are many bachelors who have been and are more of a help towards uplifting the race than the married man. Not only Jesus and Paul from a religious standpoint, but, Herbert Spencer, Henry Thoreau, Michelangelo, Sir Isaac Newton, George Peabody, Emmanuel Kant and others I cannot just now recall have furnished us with wonderful Truths in their respective lines. Paul said,—“He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please HIS wife. “There is a difference ALSO between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit,—but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband”. The idea that Paul

240 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

conveyed is not necessarily to the effect that the married man and the married woman are not capable to some extent to teach the Truth,—but it illustrates how much more time one has in which to teach and work at any certain thing, because the person who devotes all of their time to a certain vocation, are better adapted for the same, than those who work at that or this. “A Jack of all trades”, is “the master of none”. It, too, illustrates the fact that the single person can PROVE things where a married person is not in a position to prove, and so, has “authority” for what he and she claims. But there are bachelors and maids who are so, because they are selfish, or wish to satisfy themselves in living for appetite and passion, and to such I can say with Paul,—“If they cannot contain, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn”. The Spirit of the Natural is right “by permission”, but not “by commandment”. That is, it is not wrong nor a sin, if ye are not “able to receive it”. “So then, he that giveth Her in marriage doeth well: but he that giveth HER not in marriage doeth better”. If one is able to “overcome the world” NOW, as Jesus did then, they are as Paul says,—“She is happier if she abide after my judgment.”

Jesus spoke of woman making her choice in life when he said to Martha,—“But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.” These words here illustrate the two sides of life, or that Mary was better qualified to “serve the Lord”—the Truth, and Martha, that of the house, though neither were married, but it is evident here that Martha was more in favor of serving the man, or

better qualified for the home, as it says,—“ But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone ”,—then, Jesus made the aforesaid remark.

In speaking of Religion, Herbert Spencer writes, —“ For its essentially valid belief, Religion has constantly done better. Gross as were the disguises under which it first espoused this belief, and cherished this belief, though it still is, under disfiguring vestments, it has never ceased to maintain and defend it. It has everywhere established and propagated one or other modifications of a Power that transcends our knowledge. Though from age to age Science has continually defeated it wherever they have come in collision, and has obliged it to relinquish one or more of its positions,—it has still held the remaining ones with undiminished tenacity. No exposure of the logical inconsistency of its conclusions—no proof that each of its particular dogmas was absurd, has been able to weaken its allegiance to that ultimate verity for which it stands. After criticism has abolished all its arguments and reduced it to silence, there has still remained with it the indestructible consciousness of a Truth which however faulty the mode in which it has been expressed, was yet a truth beyond cavil. To this connection its adherence has been substantially sincere. And for the guardianship and diffusion of it, Humanity has ever been, and must ever be its debtor.

“ But while from the beginning, Religion has had the all-essential office of preventing man from being wholly absolved in the relative or immediate, and of awakening them to a consciousness of something

beyond it, this office has been very imperfectly discharged. Religion has ever been more or less irreligious,—and it continues to be partially irreligious even now. In the first place, as implied above, it has all along professed to have some knowledge of that which transcends knowledge,—and has so contradicted its teachings. While with one breath it has asserted that the Cause of all things passes understanding, it has, with the next breath, asserted that the Cause of all things possesses such or such attributes—can be in so far understood. In the second place, while in great part sincere in its fealty to the great truth it has had to uphold, it has often been insincere, and consequently irreligious, in maintaining the untenable doctrines by which it has obscured this great truth. Each assertion respecting the nature, acts, or motives of that Power which the universe manifests to us, has been repeatedly called in question, and proved to be inconsistent with itself, or with accompanying assertions. Yet each of them has been age after age insisted on, in spite of a secret consciousness that it would not bear examination. Just as though unaware that its central position was impregnable. Religion has obstinately held every outpost long after it was obviously indefensible. And this naturally introduces us to the third and most serious form of irreligion which Religion has displayed: namely, an imperfectly belief in that which it professes to believe. How truly its central position IS impregnable, Religion has never adequately realized. In the devoutest faith as we habitually see it, there lies hidden an innermost core of scepticism,—which causes that dread of inquiry displayed by Religion

when face to face with Science. Obligated to abandon one by one the superstitions it once tenaciously held, and daily finding its cherished beliefs more and more shaken, Religion shows a secret fear that all things may some day be explained,—and thus itself betrays a lurking doubt whether that Incomprehensible Cause of which it is conscious, is really incomprehensible.

“Of religion then, we must all remember, that amid its many errors and corruptions it has asserted and diffused a supreme verity.

“The truly religious element of Religion has always been good,—that which has proved untenable in doctrine and vicious in practice, has been its irreligious element,—and from this it has ever been undergoing purification.

“And now observe that all along, the agent which has effected the purification has been Science. We habitually overlook the fact that this has been one of its functions. Religion ignores its immense debt to Science,—and Science is scarcely at all conscious how much Religion owes it. Yet it is demonstrable that every step by which Religion has progressed from its first low conception to the comparatively high one it has now reached. Science has helped it, or rather forced it, to take; and that even now, Science is urging further steps in the same direction.

“Using the word Science in its true sense, as comprehending all positive and definite knowledge of the order existing among surrounding phenomena, it becomes manifest that from the outset, the discovery of an established order has modified that conception of disorder, or undermined order, which

underlies every superstition. As fast as experience proves that certain familiar changes always happen in the same sequence, there begins to fade from the mind the conception of a special personality to whose variable will they were before ascribed. And when, step by step, accumulating observations do the like with the less familiar changes, similar modification of belief takes place with respect to them.

“While this process seems to those who effect, and those who undergo it, an anti-religious one, it is really, the reverse. Instead of the specific comprehensible agency before assigned, there is substituted a less specific and less comprehensible agency,—and though this, standing in opposition to the previous one, cannot at first call forth the same feeling, yet, as being less comprehensible, it must eventually call forth this feeling more fully. Take an instance. Of old the Sun was regarded as the chariot of a god, drawn by horses. How far the idea thus grossly expressed, was idealized, we need not inquire. It suffices to remark that this accounting for the apparent motion of the Sun by an agency like certain visible terrestrial agencies, reduced a daily wonder to the level of the commonest intellect. When, many centuries after, Kepler discovered that the planets moved round the Sun ellipses and described equal areas in equal times, he concluded that in each planet there must exist a spirit to guide its movements. Here we see that with the progress of Science, there had disappeared the idea of a gross mechanical traction, such as was first assigned to the Sun; but that while for this there was substituted an indefinite and less easily conceivable force, it was still thought needful to as-

sume a special personal agent as a cause of the regular irregularity of motion. When, finally, it was proved that these planetary revolutions with all their variations and disturbances, conformed to one universal law—when the presiding spirit which Kepler conceived were set aside, and the force of gravitation put in their place,—the change was really the abolition of an imaginable agency, and the substitution of an unimaginable one. Newton himself confessed the force of gravitation to be incomprehensible without the intermediation of an ether; and, as we have already seen, the assumption of an ether does not in the least help us. Thus it is with Science in general. Its progress in grouping particular relations of phenomena under laws, and these special laws more and more general, is of necessity a progress to causes that are more and more abstract. And causes more and more abstract, are of necessity causes less and less conceivable, since the formation of an abstract conception involves the dropping of certain concrete elements of thought. And so is justified the assertion, that the beliefs which Science has forced upon Religion, have been intrinsically more religious than those which they supplanted."

In this—the day of understanding, or "the day of judgment", we are beginning to realize the truth to which Science has forced Religion to believe, because we are proving that experience and observation alone transcends all knowledge, and, even though the knowledge gained from past experience is different in our knowledge, it is only because "the more and more abstract" have been "causes less and less conceivable". To Religion, "Human-

ity has ever been, and must ever be its debtor",—not because it is the formula of an exact truth, but because it is the one thing to which man holds religious,—in that he is subject to a greater Power which he has not been able to conceive as a state of Mentality, and conceivable only as a Power greater than that which lies in the Physical. And, so too, because thru fear he has been lead to believe he should remain in ignorance as to what the "Unknown Cause" is like. But after becoming wise to the fact that ignorance cannot be the builder of an exact Science, he, thru past experiences has developed to a state of Knowledge wherein lies the fact that all phenomena is the resultant by growth not only in the Physical but in the Psychological, since, Evolution of any phenomena is the Physical and Psychological of that phenomena. Spencer says "we know nothing more of existence than a continued manifestation", which is enough to know, because our experience and observation tell us only things can exist by what they are in the phenomena, and, "HE THAT HATH SEEN ME, HATH SEEN THE FATHER ALSO". That is, the Physical is the phenomena of the Psychological—both concrete in form, but abstract in their meaning. Religion has "professed to have some knowledge of that which transcends knowledge", because it has ever taught there is a beyond to which you and I are an existence, when we exist only by what exists to-day, since, Thought and Physical cannot exist but by what exists in the phenomena. The "part" we have in what shall exist beyond—in the future—is the Psychological abstract of the Psychological concrete, which is no transcendental Knowl-

edge, but the Knowledge which is only existent as the Evolution of Thought reaches the Knowledge—"the resurrection"—and State of Perfection which it shall in time experience by this Knowledge.

We have now reached that generation of which Spencer speaks,—“Religion shows a secret fear that all things may some day be explained—and thus itself betrays a lurking doubt whether that Incomprehensible of which it is conscious, is really incomprehensible”. We shall not continue to say “this man’s life was mapped out for him”, or “things are so and so predestined”, when we should know that all life existence is by growth in both the Physical and Psychological. This generation has brought about a new and somewhat different Religion, because this is the age of a greater and more universal Mentality.

This new form of Religion termed “Christian Science” has advanced rapidly because it is more in tune with the Mental, than with the Physical, and, therefore characteristic with the Evolution of Thought in the form of “Good” to be manifested as life than the Organic. But because it also teaches this life as “continued” by this or that person, or in the term of “another life” distinct or separate from this, it too, lessens in itself to build a Spiritual life in “this world”—this world, because “the other world” cannot exist **HERE** (the “other world” is not an existence, other than an Idea in Truth), until **THIS WORLD**—the Natural existence shall have finished its course—“nature works to her own end”. The “other world” exists in name only, or, is but a vision of the Truth, since it is not a Reality—Existence until Manifested in **full**

or Absolute—the Spiritual body Only, instead of the present Mental and Physical body as Absolute. Do not here, be drawn away from conclusions reached by the explanation of the Thought and Physical as one, because it here alludes to the present Mental and Physical body. The explanation of a definition can hardly be explained in words, for, it is easy to form opinion by one explanation only to be contradicted by the same form of explanation. If you have followed me, it is comprehensible that the meaning of an abstract here becomes concrete, when as an abstract it is concrete in form by seeming abstracts. In other words: while the Mental and Physical are at present working as by a law, exist as a phenomena, yet, the phenomena of the Mental alone will exist as a phenomena when there shall be no use for the Physical as at present it is a phenomena with the Mental; just as a slight illustration, we have no use at present for wire in transmission of thought and the like; while heretofore it was impossible to send a message without the use of wire.

There is no doubt but that in her earlier stage of “searching the scriptures”, that Mrs. Eddy was then led a great deal toward the Truth, as all are led toward this or that in proportion to their seeking anything, especially if it be from an impersonal view. But, like all persons building for “POMP”, and even unconscious of its growth until it reaches such proportions where it cannot be overcome, it hinders the builder from progressing in that Evolution, does not necessarily depend on the individual, so she, like all others at the “head” of a given thing, will release its hold on the Progress of

Thought. It is because we have looked up to what the other fellow said that we are sometimes made his inferior. My twelve years' study and work with the works, and "class instruction", of Mrs. Eddy, did not bring about the results that should follow such sincere desire to believe in all she said, and now I realize why, since, I know by experience that Knowledge is reached by experience which is a growth thru Thought of the same. We must get away from the idea of any "leader" of Truth, because Truth has no leader, but is a leader in itself. We can hardly call any person a "revelator" of Truth, but we can prophesy Truth from our experience and observation, and also experience and observe some of the Truth, but not ALL—the fullness of Truth, since, "THE END IS NOT YET". If there were such a thing as Infallibility to-day, there need be no effort to advance, for, we could not advance if we are Infallible. It would be absurd for you to believe as I do, if it worked against your conscience, even if I speak the Truth. To your conscience a lie may be the truth, and is the truth to you. I remember I could not convince by telling a friend that a certain street lay so and so in a certain part of town, and he was wroth with me for contradicting him, but I took him to where it was and proved it did not lay as he believed it did. His idea was the Truth to him, and would have remained so, if he had not been taken there and proved otherwise, and for me to argue against his opinion before this, was in error, since he was satisfied in his own conscience.

The people as a Religious body are forever worshipping Jesus, as some worship Mrs. Eddy, and

so for this reason they cannot bear any fruit, because they worship the thing, instead of doing that thing left as an example, since, he nor she are anything to be worshiped. Science teaches that we must experience and do likewise, and not worship things, or that we cannot worship God, but must experience Thought as God is Thought, and will be Thought and this IS KNOWLEDGE, because it is experienced Thought, and therefore "THE RESURRECTION", from a Lower to a Higher—Heaven—conception of life.

We observe Easter and Christmas, and make holidays for this and that birthday, and "Decoration" day, when they are no more to observe than yours and mine. It fails to build us like the EXAMPLE when we simply worship such persons and observe the days; besides, you and I are fighting the battles for an existence, and though it is not with "bullets", it is as hard a fought battle as in war. It is a war in one sense of the word, and really a more upright battle than fought in days gone by, and the reward can only be an existence for us, as it was for them, and we are heroes as they were heroes. No wonder Christmas, birthdays and the like have grown to be a matter of business only. All forms of "custom" fall into the rank and file of business, showing as it does, not any real regret for the past, and those gone before, but a pleasure mostly to those of the present—a selfishness only in its significance. If, instead of building monuments to this and that person, we would build our own characters equal to that person or cause,—then would we build monuments that are not only good to look upon and to be remembered, but that are

everlasting ("My words shall live"), for, nothing can destroy True character, and Truth, while the monuments built of stone, well,—“there shall not be left here one stone upon another”. So, Religion is hindering persons, as a rule, to live and seek the Truth, because it only OBSERVES and WORSHIPS the life that should be lived, since many of the leaders of many Religions fall under the banner of sin, and that is why we find fault with Religion generally. The most complete memory and monument you should have and build for Lincoln, is to live the life and principle he taught and lived, and not to think that by observing his birthday and building monuments, and talking about the good HE DID, will build up the same for you. Many grand and beautiful architectural structures in the way of Churches and monuments have been and are builded by money illegally as well as legally gained, and worshiped because the ignorant seem to think a structure could not stand unless it was built “in the name of God”. While we can use and do need a building where we can lecture and discourse on religious subjects pertaining to Christianity, it need not be construed into a fact that such must be a KIND of Temple or Building. There is not a Kind of Truth. You make it a Kind of Truth, or a Creed or a Sect, when you erect a building for this or that, which is very nicely illustrated in Matthew 24:2. It says,—“And Jesus went out and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to *him* for to shew him the buildings of the temple. “And Jesus said unto them, See ye all of these things? Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another,

that shall not be thrown down". These stones representing false doctrines or many creeds are not laid upon the foundation of Truth, so the buildings of such doctrines or stones shall be rent from their places when the real Knowledge of "What is Truth?" shall be known.

We will now take up the subject of the birth of Jesus, because there has been so much said in regard to it—so much misconception, which has formed the idea of his being the "immaculate conception", or that he was "born of God and Mary". This, too, has gave chance to form different Religious Views, and build monuments to the dead—doctrine of these views. Coming into the sense and reasonableness of all Creation, which is but the form of development of things to their fulness, and not that they WERE CREATED, we cannot or should not conceive the idea of any miraculous thing being formed out of the ordinary law of things. If you believed in that Jesus produced "fish" by which he "filled the hungry", then you too, believe in "fish stories", or that things can be formed out of the ordinary law of Time required in development. However, I cannot believe the passage referred to should be taken in such a light as feeding with material food. It being so many years since any record had been made of the life work of Jesus, it is possible that these remarks are the result of what the disciples seemed to see and hear, or they, like the remark written concerning the fatherhood of Jesus, appeared to them "in a dream". To quote from Emerson here, is to give a hint as to how truly things are not what they always seem to the naked eye and ear in a certain state of consciousness, and

he here gives my idea of how things are made use of in deceiving the mortal sense of sight.

He says, "Nature may be as selfishly studied as trade. Astronomy to the selfish becomes Astrol-ogy; psychology, mesmerism (with intent to show where our spoons have gone); and anatomy and physiology become phrenology and palmistry". This "intent to show where our spoons are gone" is significant of what we are trying thru psychology—mesmerism or spiritualism and the like beliefs to show WHERE WE ARE GOING, or that, WE HAVE BEEN THERE AND CAME BACK, since we are under such use of the term mesmerised to such a belief, as well as the idea that "disease is only a belief". Astrologers would tell us that we are governed by this or that star—making some a fool and others wise, and therefore no chance to rise up from under or above certain conditions we have been in, when really, a change of environment will make a certain change in us, not only in the Mental but in the Physical, since changed environments will produce a different thought or thoughts as different than those thought before, and may accordingly result in diseased and bodily conditions. I rather agree with Shakespeare when he said, "The fault dear Brutus is not in OUR STARS, but in ourselves that we are underlings." But, of course, we are led to "believe" the "stars" have such to deal with us, so then we are subject to this belief, since we are subject to our Thought which "in ourselves" IS ourselves also, and making us governed by "our stars" because of such a belief, but not because of any fault of the stars. The SEEMING miracles performed by Jesus were

only to illustrate that Thought is Power in the Science of which it can be used, and if we look to them only according to the theory as miracles, or interpret the remarks made in the Bible as miraculous, we can only see them as being caused by some Being. They should be looked upon as a case of mesmerism—an influence of the Power of Thought over the Mortal sense of sight, but as psychology, we view them from a Spiritual Sense working in a form of growth in Thought and Power over the Thought and Power of the Natural Sense. We are then drawn away from it as mesmerism because it is not to satisfy self, nor executed to create wonderment, as all growth of the psychological in changing things is the result of Time required in which to make this change which cannot be made on the instant, any more than the physical growth can be made at a moment's notice as assigned to "the loaves and fishes". The first miracle performed by Jesus could not have been done as a direct part, or caused by the will of Thought as applied to God, or in the Sense of Good, and illustrates the idea of how one works even at the expense of a falsehood to uplift mankind. The miracle referred to is "the water changed to wine", which was not changed, but the Mental state of those present was changed, and for a purpose. It is barely conceivable that the Law of Good—Thought in the name of God which is to destroy the law of appetite and passion, and all things contrary to promote happiness, should HERE BE IN the VERY ACT of producing the effect of that which it aims to destroy. This passage simply illustrates how easily man under the bond of sin

and ignorance and superstitious persons are so much more subject to deception than one having viewed things from a Scientific point of view.

We cannot but admire some of the ancient characters, especially those who professed to be "MAGICIANS". The work of these men was studied to some advantage even by their opponents, and perhaps one of the greatest of these was Virgil, of whom I quote the following,—

"Virgil, the Magician, is the character in which the great Roman Poet presented himself to the popular imagination of the middle ages. The origin of this singular delusion may be thus explained. From a very early period—almost, we may say, from the age in which he flourished—Virgil was acknowledged to be the prince of Latin Poets.

"His poems threw all others in the shade, and this, not so much because they exhibited a finer and more original genius, as because their style was perfect, the subject of his *magnum opus* thoroughly national, and his immense historical and antiquarian lore devoted to the glorification of the Roman people. From him the grammarians selected the examples of their rules, and even composed treatises on special questions suggested by his poems. The rhetoricians, too, found their material for their themes and declamations, and the later poets imitated his phraseology.

"Very soon the idea sprung up that in his verses there lay hidden quite a peculiar wisdom and mystic meaning. Thus it happened, that as early as the 3d and 4th centuries, even Christian authors had contracted the habit of regarding him reverentially, a feeling which in its turn induced them to

256 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

use him polemical, or at least for theological purposes.

"Hence they sought to prove the beginning of the fourth Eclogue a Messianic prediction, and would have it that Virgil foresaw the day of Christ. This view rooted itself so deeply, that Virgil and the Sibyl were actually introduced into the liturgy of the Church, along with the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, and in the "mysteries of the middle ages are frequently cited as bearing witness to a coming messiah. Furthermore, when the first ages of polemical theology arrived, biblical critics and controversialists did not hesitate to quote the verses of Virgil in elucidation of passages of scripture, and in confirmation of their views."

The reason the above quotation is presented here in connection with the birth of Jesus, is not so much so that it has any bearing with his birth, but to show the interest taken in such persons having the knowledge and power to deceive and influence those who are ignorant and religiously superstitious. It is because of this that it was easy to write then concerning an "immaculate conception" and have the people believe it because of such power and influence over them. We can with Reason then, conclude that Jesus was under the same Law of Creation as we, and all other formations, consequently, not an "immaculate conception", for there are no "miracles" under the name of Law and Order. In view of this as the only means of Natural formation, it is hardly permissible that the birth of Jesus should be viewed in any other light than a son to Joseph and Mary, though there can be OPINIONS

to the contrary. It was NO SIN for Mary to "be with child", though in the Bible she is called a "virgin", simply because in those days they called women virgins who lived under certain beliefs held by the Church, and men were "priests", for it was "the chief priests in the Church who said "crucify him", because they were opposed to his teaching. No doubt this is the reason Jesus taught against the then religious doctrine, because, when he had reached the age of maturity, he had learned of his birth and why his mother left the Church and country, where she was afterwards sought and found with the child in a "manger". It was then that Joseph, who, no doubt, was a priest, was troubled in his conscience, and also left the Church and followed Mary. This state of, not only a guilty conscience is illustrated in Matthew, but also that no shame be passed on the character of one who wished to uphold what she had believed sacred.

It says,—“Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. “But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream”. It is amusing to read what a “JUST MAN” Joseph was, but rather, how he wished the truth to be withheld from the public if possible, and how ALL MEN have ever since been “JUST”, or that their character could never be ruined, but for women, well; she could have no character remain after such an experience. But times are changing, and the character will be looked upon by all alike, besides, a child, no matter how it came in the world, if it be healthy and mature into usefulness, there will

258 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

be no stain upon it, since, like all acts of Nature, it is the result of that act, though its elders may be held up to ridicule. So then, it gives the idea that it "appeared in a dream" to Joseph, but as nearly three hundred years had passed since any record was given of the birth of Jesus, it is easy to understand how and why the writer of this epistle could and should make such a statement in order to lay no blame to the Religion. Rather strange that the other sons and daughters born to Joseph and Mary should not have been born likewise. But it is out of the question to consider any other conception than the regular course under the Law of Nature. I can conceive the idea that "virgin" here, simply signifies purity of Thought above other women of her time, because of a desire to be the mother of "the Christ" to be born in that period as prophesied. This Thought could here be held in Consciousness, and the child would take on such a condition of Thought as the conscience developed to that state of maturity. This is proof to some extent because she left the Church that the child might not be born and influenced by such environments, and because she entertained more of a Higher Ideal than the Christian life taught by the Church.

I understand there are some women in the East, who, because of the "BELIEF" taught by Mrs. Eddy that "Jesus Christ was born of God and Mary",—are trying to "demonstrate" this as a fact by having a child, without the aid of the Natural Law of Creation. This—her idea is not given out to the public in general, yet, it is her belief that "the time is coming when all shall be born of God and woman" thru such a demonstration. With

all due respect to Mrs. Eddy and that part of her works which is able to relieve man from disease than any other doctrine taught in the Church, I cannot here avoid criticizing some of her absurd opinions. The idea given by her is not the result of her knowing the Exact Truth or Science, but an opinion drawn from ignorance of Creation, or that "God made man Perfect". When you follow the idea that God is Thought and Thought is Power, and therefore not the Cause of the origin of Creation, but IS a New Creation Thought to be formed out of Creation, you can more fully Judge—Understand how it is possible in Time for GOD and MAN to overcome the world—Natural condition, and how man is to "BE BORN AGAIN". If God created the world and Man, and then said "Man should overcome the world", it would be absurd and impossible, since, man could not overcome that which he is on an equality with, for, no mountain can rise higher than its own. But God can rise higher than the mountain, because Thought is Higher or Superior or Above any Material condition, and, so Man as God—the Image of Thought—can rise above that which is created, but, not so, if he was OF THE CREATION. Besides, God could and should not be responsible for all the disorder existing, which is impossible in the Science—Knowledge that "you cannot gather grapes from thistles".

The earth is the receptacle of the seed, as the Natural Law of increasing or multiplying, which will produce its kind; so likewise is the woman the receptacle of the seed which will produce its like,—the sex of the child being determined by the Law

260 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

that governs the order of Creation. So Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, but Christ—the Idea of a Spiritual Creation—was born of God, because it is a Thought. Jesus most always looked to God as the Father—Thought within—and this is why it was very easy to hold to the opinion that he was an “immaculate conception”, or “born of God”. He said “Call no man on the earth your Father, for one is your Father, even God”, which is not in evidence to-day, nor a recognition of the same, let alone, that ignorant generation. He could not say with profit: “call no one on the earth your mother”, any more than he could profit by saying “call no man on the earth your Father”, if it was not to hold the Spiritual view of life instead of the Natural conception of life. Again, why did Jesus say “call no man on the earth your Father”, when HE KNEW that there was such? if it were not but TO CHANGE OUR BASE OF THOUGHT from a Natural, to a Spiritual conception of life. But how can we read Luke 1: 26, 27, and still remain under this cloud of ignorance as to the marriage of Joseph and Mary, and a father and mother to Jesus? It reads,—“And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, “To a virgin *espoused* to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary”. What better evidence do we or can we wish as authority, than what is written here to the fact that Mary—she a virgin—was married—“ESPOUSED”—to Joseph? It plainly signifies here that Mary, like all women after a certain length of time or six months, or in the “sixth month”, was in a pregnate state, or “with

child". Again, I say it came to her during her marriage to Joseph that the child now in its "sixth month" was to be the Jesus that should reveal Christ, or the Spiritual Idea which was to be lived in the world then as much as possible, and by continued Thought respecting the same, it shall finally be the One life. This conscious state of Spirituality or Mentality with Mary, was due to her past life of Virginity—Purity of Thought, which enabled her to receive the Divine Conception, and afterwards mother it in the form of Jesus. We can also conclude from this that the foundation is laid for Good and Evil during the development of the embryo, therefore it behooves the mother to look to her Mental realm for any deficiency which may dwell there. So it is very evident that the Spiritual Conception of "the Christ" that should be BORN to Jesus, and BORNE by him after he reached the age in which he could impart it to the people was due to his ever recognition of the same during his early life.

After reading the remarks in Luke 1:26 and 27, where it gives the marriage of Joseph and Mary, BEFORE Jesus was born, as just mentioned,—how ridiculous are the remarks in Luke 1:34 and 35, or just following the former, since one seemingly denies the other. But the significance of the two verses first mentioned alludes to Jesus—the Natural and Physical form being now in its sixth month, due to her marriage as it says, with Joseph, while the following 34th and 35th allude to Christ—the Spiritual and Mental Idea to be received by Mary during her pregnate state. It reads: "Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing

I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come unto thee; and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy *thing* which shall be born of thee,—shall be called the Son of God”. Note, it calls it a thing, or not necessarily a person, and we “NEED TO KNOW NOT A MAN” in order to receive it as Mary received it. The remark: “it is born”—conceived by Mary, or given as coming from her, or born of woman, is because the word woman signifies a sending forth, or as that which gives out, or it comes from such a source, because Jesus came from such, as all multiplication is from such a source. To repeat, for your own benefit; how ridiculous is the latter remark made by Mary,—“How can this be, when I know not a man”, when, in the verse previous to this remark, it claims Mary and Joseph were married—“ESPOUSED”.

In searching for information on the subject of what concerns the bringing about of Jesus, or his birth in connection with what concerns his mother, I will quote the following,—

“The actual controversy in the West may be said to have commenced with St. Bernard, who not only remonstrated with the canons of Lyon in 1131 for their unauthorized introduction of this festival in their Cathedral, but rejected the opinion of the Blessed Virgin having been conceived from original sin, though he admitted her sanctification in her mother’s womb.

“The council of Basel—although, it is true, at the time when it was in conflict with the Pope—declared “the doctrine of the immaculate concep-

tion to be a Catholic dogma, and reprobated in the strongest terms, the opposite opinion”.

While the subject may have been considered as “unauthorized” in those days, it is highly important to-day; so that it may be “introduced” in its proper term, or what is actually “born of God”, and what is born of man and woman, since the former opinion has given every man the excuse to claim that he—man and woman cannot “overcome the world”—sexual—as Jesus did, but that he could overcome because he was “born of God”, and so, could not be subject to the world like as we. It is because of this “belief”, and necessarily AN EXCUSE CAUSED FROM THIS BELIEF, that has and will make “THE WORD OF GOD OF NONE EFFECT” HERE. That is, the Word—Christ—will not become a present possibility, if man only looks to it as a separate and future life for him. The belief that he overcome “our sins”, is all rot, and necessarily makes his teaching vain. Thru the understanding that ALL MEN created are subject to the same God—Thought as Jesus was, it will bind man to that claim, and thereby bring about the thing prophesied, or, “the end of the world”. Continuing further it reads:

“Sextus IV., however, imposed on the defenders of both opinions, in 1470, the obligation of mutual toleration and charity, and renewed this constitution in 1493; but in the end of the same century, the University of Paris required, as a condition of the doctorate, an oath on the part of the candidate; that he would defend the dogma of the immaculate conception. The Council of Trent, without discussing the scholastic dispute, merely de-

clared that "in its decree on original sin it did not comprehend the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary": and renewed the constitution of Sextus IV., already referred to".

The wise Sextus IV. conceived the idea would be better under the existing conditions to form a constitution of "the obligations of mutual toleration and charity", rather than dispute over a subject, that if uncovered in its entirety, would reveal the truth, and cause consternation in the Church. It was wise not to "comprehend" the truth, and so they did not question the "scholastic dispute". It is as if such exposure would overthrow their Religion, since it would reveal the falsity of what they generally term Virgin. Also, that it could be kept a secret and be of more use in those days, because ignorance, or an "unknown God" seemed to be in obeisance, rather than the actual truth, and, even to-day it is not viewed only in the slightest degree toward the truth of its actuality. Again it says: "Of her personal history, but few particulars are recorded in scripture. The apocryphal gospels, entitled, "The gospel of the nativity of Mary", and the "Protevangelion of the Birth of Christ", contain some additional, but, of course, unauthentic particulars as to the lineage, birth, and early years of Mary".

While it claims to give the history, and the "nativity of Mary", yet it concludes they are "unauthentic". It is sometimes amusing to read "the life" of a person by some authors, and find almost the whole work is made up of suppositional material. It was a very easy matter in those days to destroy records and documents pertaining to the

life of Jesus and Mary if it hindered the growth of Religion, because the heads of Religion were in power to do as they pleased. One author says "the date of the birth of Jesus is now GENERALLY fixed a few years—at least four—before the commencement of the Christian Era. The reason of this *opinion we cannot here state, but it may be observed* that the reckoning of dates from the birth of Christ did not begin until the *sixth century, when error on such a point was very probable*". The italics are mine. This statement were just as well if it remained silent, since it aims to tell "the date", but winds up by as much saying that it knows nothing for a certainty as to the date. There are many "points" on which "error" has withheld the truth in Religion, whether unintentionally or purposely.

There is too much custom and formality existing in the world to-day, by which Religion is formed, so that, we are rendering "the things that be of Cæsar", rather than "THE THINGS THAT BE OF GOD". We should not be chastised nor criticised if we do not, as the Church has and does to-day uphold and behold the form of Mary in her virginity, since Jesus, her son, never looked to her in the light of so great a personality. In reality, he rejected her always, as pointed out heretofore, and also in the following,—as given in Luke 2: 48 to 50.

"And when they saw him, they were amazed, and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing". Note here that Mary calls Joseph the "father" of Jesus, with the same respect that she alludes to herself as mother. "And

he said unto them. How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? "And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them".

Here we find that with all the spiritual belief which Mary contained, she was not able to "understand" the words which Jesus "spake" unto her about HIS "Father's business". Paul's comprehension was much better than conceived by Mary, as he said,—“Though we have known Christ AFTER THE FLESH, yet henceforth know we him no more”. In other words, It is to be lived in the Spirit, instead of “after the flesh” HERE, as the words of Paul signify not to be “known”—lived—after the flesh here.

In prophesying the coming of Christ, or the person who should reveal a Higher life than lived then and the present,—it did not say who should reveal it, but that it would be known who that person was, by the character of one of those born in that day. Mary seemed to be the one in her own mind, though it is recorded that in those days, others, who were “with child”, went before “the magistrate” to know if the child to be born of them should reveal Christ—the Idea of life to be lived in the world. But Mary, above all others, recognized the condition under which the mother and child should be, therefore, the “Angel” in the form of a Thought came to her, regardless of what the Prelate should say or dictate.

Having learned then, that God is Thought, and that Soul is Sense, in the light that a Sense of this life to be reached, is thru a Sense of Thought or God as Power over and above the Natural Condi-

tion we arrive at what "the resurrection" is, or that "the knowledge gained is "the resurrection" referred to. So then, when the final State of Immortality, shall be reached, there will then be "no marriages", because people shall be as the "Angels of God in heaven", which is the Highest conception of life that can be reached. Judging from the condition of the world to-day and in the past,—it will be thousands of years before this realization can be made. But, if it has been millions of years in bringing about the Natural State of Evolution, we shall, and should not consider more of the future than is reasonable, since, "no man knoweth, not even the Son, what God hath prepared for them that love him". So, by the Evolution of Thought will be brought about the Spiritual State of an existence.

Jesus said,—“For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed ARE the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck.” Emerson says “Marriage (in what is called the spiritual world) is impossible, because of the inequality between every subject and every object. The subject is the receiver of God-head, and at every comparison must feel his being enhanced by that cryptic might”. Whatever might be his opinion of “the spiritual world”, it is hardly permissible that Emerson believed in “another world.” So his statement here in what—as he says is “CALLED” the Spiritual world, simply expresses his idea to the fact that it would be impossible for anything of two distinct natures to form any alliance with each other. And so it is, as I have pointed out,—impossible for there

268 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

to be any marriage when that State of Thought pertaining to One Life as God is reached, since, it requires the state of two opposites to exist, in order to form a partnership, or, "the inequality between every subject and every object". In other words, the subject is above the object at every point, or "at every comparison must feel his being enhanced by that cryptic might".

I say then, with Paul, that "Marriage is not a wrong" in one Sense, or, "he doeth well", but, in the True Sense, "he doeth better", not to marry if he IS "ABLE TO RECEIVE IT"—receive what? why, able to "overcome the world"—sexual indulgence. When man becomes, as it says, "one with God" in Spirit, or Thought,—Man cannot marry, since, HE IS God—One—and God—Man cannot marry himself. When there is only one condition of Thought, which is God, there can be only one God and Man. It stands to Reason, that if All had the same Idea—Christ—as Jesus, and Paul also after he had overcome the world, that that would be the end of Creation, or the Natural Condition. So then, marriage is given "by permission"—"he doeth well", but not "by commandment"—"he doeth better", for, both the Spiritual and Natural Condition must exist until the Spiritual is declared by Thought or God to be the Only—One life, and of a certainty,—the Spiritual Life—God cannot be exclusively lived while BOTH the Spiritual and Natural are lived. Who knows, but perhaps, that if "all men" had the Christ Idea, which would be the end of Nature, that it may be there would another kind of Creation spring from this, as a result of this Creation formed thru

Thought. We might go so far back in Genesis where the words written could even signify such an end. It says,—in Genesis 6:6,—“And it repenteth the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart”. Yet, I can understand how the writer, having been living too much after the flesh and became sore and vexed from the same, that, he conceived such an idea, and wrote from his own feelings, the above experience, since, we know to-day, that by careful study, that the Old Testament is written as a result of how people lived and Thought as to the life they lived. While, “marriage is a failure” to many who seek it in the wrong, it is also a blessing to those who seek it in the right, yet, “in the flesh ye shall have trouble”. Jesus did not speak much on marriage, and when he did, it was on parable lines, or very obscure. He knew it required Time for “Nature to work to her own end”, as all perfection is based on Time. But I predict there shall be an end to Time, when Perfection is reached, because there will then be no use for Time.

In Matthew 19:7 and 8 we read,—“They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? “He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so”. The law of divorce given by Moses, gives us an idea of how the average mortal stood in those days, because of man’s brute nature—the sexual indulgence of desire—and the same desire which Christ aims to destroy. Perhaps the last reference made by Jesus

in regard to marriage, and which is the most important of them all, will be found in Matthew, as well as the other Apostles. It is the most important, because it gives "the resurrection" and marriage together, which meaning is to imply that there can be no marriage when "the resurrection"—the Knowledge of what the Truth is concerning a Spiritual life is, which, of course, must be also lived according to this Knowledge. "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, "Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up seed unto his brother. "Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. "Jesus answered and said unto them, ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. "For in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. "And when the multitude heard THIS, they were astonished at his doctrine."

The Sadducees were nearer the Truth in one sense of the word than those who were "astonished at his doctrine", for, like the doubting Thomas, the questions of the Sadducees brought forth the "doctrine" that the thing to know, was "the Power of God"—Thought to raise man up to a Higher life then and there. Thru the questions of the Sadducees we will find that "the resurrection of the dead", are not the

dead as we have always BELIEVED, and in fact, does not refer to man directly, but indirectly, as heretofore explained. Now the Sadducees were very anxious to know the facts, and so, they brought out all the above as relating to THEMSELVES, or, THOSE PRESENT THEN AND THERE, as we would do NOW in asking. Therefore, it was a DIRECT QUESTION, and the reply should have been a direct reply, or refer to those present, as it should if we asked the question for OUR SAKE. But, NOTE THE REPLY,—“In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage”. Whereas, had it been intended for THOSE PRESENT, or FOR US, it should read YOU, instead of they neither marry nor are given in marriage”. You is plural here, or can be used as a plural term. It follows then, that “they” as used in the place of YOU, refers to a certain period, or generation, or future, or “hereafter”, or beyond the then and now present time, and not to you, or those asking the question. But because Jesus said “THEY neither marry nor are given in marriage”, it is easy to understand how the word “they” can be ignorantly interpreted, because of the remark,—“they all had her” is here given. But, if this latter remark is taken in such a light of a hereafter for those and us, or concerning them and us, or those who marry, or THOSE WHO ARE EVEN SINGLE WHILE LIVING DURING THE MARRIAGEABLE ERA, or as two conditions as then and now are present,—it should be sentenced when reading, “God is not the God of the dead but of the living”, for, the Sadducees remarked that “THEY WHO HAD HER WERE DEAD”, just as we remark

about the dead and believe they or we shall live forever, or be "resurrected".

Having convinced you—aimed to at least, that "Angels" are not necessarily individuals, nor masculine and feminine, but, that Angel is a term used to Express God in the form of Thought, therefore, the same, or a synonym,—we can conclude that "the angels of God in heaven", when speaking of the resurrection and marriage, is the Highest conception of life, and "they neither marry nor are given in marriage", because THEY—people who have reached the same State as "They" the "Angels" cannot marry since they are in One Condition of Thought. Let us again repeat this quotation,—“In the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in Heaven” (i.e.) In the Knowledge that Thoughts concerning God is the Highest conception of life, they cannot marry because there is no opposite conception of life. I wish to repeat that those who are able to “overcome the world” as Jesus and Paul did, while living in the marriageable Era, are under the Natural and Spiritual Law of Death and Life or Natural Condition, but that “ALL MEN” shall be even as “I am”, is the end of the Natural condition—“end of the world”. So then, the State of Immortality will, of course, be in the “hereafter” HERE, because it is not true here to-day.

It has always been a wonder to me how Mrs. Eddy could entertain the idea as I do, or that “the time is coming when there shall be no marriage”—this—a copy of her remark—and yet cling to the idea that she, or any of us who are now living, shall continue to live, after what is termed death, or the

death of that person. Her two terms are contradictory, that is,—to claim there shall be no marriage here, and claim that we continue to exist, is to throw those who do not marry in a different state than we, when ALL PEOPLE—"they"—are referred to as THE SAME, or the passage is directed to all persons, or refers to a time or period when all people are of the same Thought—God. Such a State then, throws us of to-day as in no way connected with a future life, other than that we are PARTAKERS of the same life NOW, and therefore a HELP as in all walks of life to that or this State in the future by having "PART in the resurrection"—SOME of the Knowledge of a Higher Life. You can or ought to be able to see clearly that Mrs. Eddy cannot, nor you cannot link the two ideas together. It therefore proves that she is unable to explain WHY "there shall be no marriage", and still hold the idea good as to herself and her followers living hereafter, or that they continue to exist in the form of Spirit by saying HERE,—“Man is Spiritual and not Material”. Her idea in a way, is like all RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, since it does not necessarily remove the SELF idea—finite—of a future, or another life for you and I. But for the article I recently read in a newspaper concerning marriage, I should not have mentioned the above, yet, it is necessary in order to draw out and make my interpretations correct, or more thoroughly understood. The article said, “Regarding marriage Mrs. Eddy never interferes with any individual’s discretion in this matter except when she believes the person unfit for this step. Marriages are common in the Christian Science Church”. This, of course, is not a re-

mark made by Mrs. Eddy, but upheld by her followers and even Mrs. Eddy, since, it was not contradicted by her, as it should have been when it came to her notice, if she had not been in sympathy with it. The above article was published because of her idea in regard to marriage which had been assaulted by other denominations. If then, she believes marriage is only for those who are fit to be (she is correct here in my opinion) SHE HERE ENTIRELY denies the teaching of Jesus Christ in that he said "they neither marry nor are given in marriage"—not claiming here that it is only intended for those who are "unfit". In other words, her remarks refuse to accept the idea that Jesus "overcome the world"—sexual indulgence, as AN EXAMPLE, that the TRUE FOLLOWERS should in time, or at some future Time, do likewise, also, making Jesus and Paul "unfit" for the marriageable state, because they did not marry. It is also a slur on those who profess to be Christian Scientists in case they are able to overcome, and so do not marry, since they would be held up to ridicule, because it infers they are "UNFIT" to do so. That "marriages are common in the Christian Science Church" is no wonder, and is true because it could not be otherwise in that Church, any more than any other, nor those outside of the Church, since, it is a Law of the Natural Condition, which also proves the religious teaching is like all Religion in that it evades, to some extent the Truth Scientifically put. Marriage is proper, because it "becometh us to fulfil all righteousness",—right until a better or different condition is reached, since Error is sometimes imperative until Truth renders itself Abso-

lute. Do not think Jesus said "be of good cheer" just to console you to the fact that he "overcome the world" FOR YOU, but that you should be of "good cheer" to know that YOU could "overcome the world" likewise as he had proven thru Thought or God as having Power over the organs of Nature.

In connection with marriage,—there is no word that has been so much misused, or I might better say abused, as the word "Love", as to being, or doing good for the husband and wife and children. It is, as I shall aim to prove, a word that should be used in doing good for this or that person whether there be any blood relation or not, and so is referred to by Jesus as "Ye shall love one another". So, the word Love should be used only when connecting it with God and Man, because it is the Thought to help man, or all men and women. The word "affection" applies more to marriage than the word "Love", however, we will use the latter here out of respect to marriage until convinced that it is not always properly used in connection with marriage: First, to use the quotation, "God is Love", or Love is Thought, denote a condition of Thought that cannot be applied to marriage, or because two persons are married. People are bound to respect and Love each other irrespective of marriage. This is why the word is applied to God, and is only used towards man and all men when that Thought is the same. Now we hear, the reason a man marries, and a woman marries, is because he loved her, and she loved him. But, this is not true, because Love here is connected with passion as Meredith wrote, "What is love, but passion", or we hear the remark,—"Love at sight",

which I claim, is passion right, because it could not express the common view of Love in that we are supposed to be in company with each other for some time in order to entertain a feeling of Love and respect. I say, He that is married, but looketh upon another woman, saying, "I have found my affinity", hath only lost his love of passion for the other, since love, or passion, dieth when it cannot further seek its own. That is, when passion cannot satisfy itself in one, it seeks another in which to satisfy itself—passion—which is so commonly called Love. It has been called Love, but we learn from the remarks made by Jesus, and also experience, that the heart is more capable of "evil thoughts, murder, adulteries", etc., than of Love, which heart, is guided more by brain and nerves, as in the animal, therefore, Natural, than that which is of God. I wish to prove to you all along, that in everything, or outside of the Seventh Sense—Soul of a Higher Life, all pertains to selfishness, which same is characteristic of all animal life due to what is termed Nature, or Creation, which is the lower or animal nature in us. We can say the love of passion, because love is a synonym to Spirit when associated with God and Satan as the Spirit of Good and Evil, or Love of Good and Evil, and because Love is Thought. But it should only apply to the Higher Sense if we wish to use it in the term it refers to in the Bible. How could you connect the word Love with this remark—"Love your neighbor as yourself", or in the case when the Samaritan helped a man who had "fallen among thieves", for, he had not known the man, which, according to those engaged to be married is necessary in order to

LOVE each other. But the Samaritan "knew God"—Expressed the Spirit of Love in ACTION when helping "the stranger". Now watch the CHANGE in mortals who profess love for each other. Where this supposed love has been in the heart, which is only passion, it is changed to one of hatred, by a single word or provocation by the opposite party. But this love returns when the party has "made up", that is, the passion returns when they have made up. People are known to LOVE many times, for they marry often, and it has been said "they loved the second and third more than the first", not because it was a better match as to a better man or woman, but simply because the love of passion is greater for the second and third, than it was for the first. Though the dictionaries have classed the word "affection" with the word "Love", I cannot agree that they are the same in the true sense of expression. When referring to "God is Love", Paul says, "But the fruit of the Spirit is Love". But he refers to the opposite, or "affection" when he says,—“And they that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts”. Again,—“God gave them up to vile affections”. So, we find here that Paul places a great difference between the word Love and the word affection. He connects "affection and lusts" with the flesh, because, as he says, the flesh is crucified—destroyed—ALONG with the affection and lusts”,—making them a connection with the heart, which heart is guided more by the Natural desire, than the Thought and Mind, which latter "Mind was in Christ Jesus". Of course, Paul is here mistaken in applying God as the Cause of giving "them

up to vile affections", although Thought will give you up to vile affections, but not the Thought concerning God or Good. Jesus said, "Every kingdom divided against itself cannot stand". In other words, if God gave man up to vile affections, the kingdom—Spirit of God cannot stand. Neither could the Kingdom—Spirit of Satan stand, if it gave man up to that which is good, because it would then destroy its own Kingdom—Spirit. This remark by Paul, simply illustrates the fact that "vile affections" cannot have any connection with Love or God, yet Paul's opinion about God being so opposed to that which is Good, might have formed the opinion that God was a Being. But, when we find that God, rightly interpreted, is a Thought and not a Being, we can understand how a Thought of One is able to destroy the Thought of another, or rather, how one Thought is able to destroy the other, less we become to believe there is a Being by saying, the Thought "OF" another.

So then, Love is the Spirit to do good, and is not, and cannot be expressed by caressing as shown between man and woman, nor even between mother and child, which latter—caressing—is what I term emotion due to natural and selfish instinct as in the animal, or to the heart being worked up by a feeling that ONE BELONGS TO THE OTHER, or a fear that they shall be separated, as this emotion is more noticeable when a separation takes place. These emotional feelings are not the result of loving, or do not necessarily express love, but emotion, and are the unrest or excited feelings and should be controled, rather than submitted to. The senses are at unrest because you worry over that

which does not belong to you, when they belong to the law of nature or are an act of nature. They are given by nature and are destroyed or taken away by a process of the organism which treats of diseased conditions. The animal shows even such signs, and they know nothing of what ought to be termed love, or God in the Sense of Higher things, or have no mind of their own, but is also a sign of selfishness, since they only protect their own young, as a rule. Selfishness belongs only to nature, or, is a part of nature. We are becoming less selfish, because we are growing away from nature, yet, we are unable to see this growth. It is hidden in the fact though, by occasionally reading of where men of views have written the same in regard to not being "humanitarian" because they have expressed the fact that "older women" are not to be looked after so much as the young. But, I predict the time will be when these "older" persons, as well as some others not in health, will lose their selfish view to that extent they will be glad to depart by some easier death than to wait until a crippled age has relinquished them from their present difficulty. There will, I trust, be no "law" to that effect, but it will be a desire within themselves. The selfish desire to remain with their people will be outgrown by the fact that they have run their full course in being a benefit to the race, and so, depart in peace, rather than depart when nature alone has its day.

People talk of the selfishness of others, when there is not one but entertains a part in selfishness. Show me a non-selfish person, and I will show you the end of the world. I read an article recently written by a traveling Minister in which it said "The selfish

person is a worse person to reform than a criminal". If he had but reflected on himself, he could have discovered just what he referred to—"the selfish person", for we can readily detect in the man working to receive a "reward in heaven", the worst form of selfishness, since, he would not be working for the cause if it were not for what he expected to receive in the future—a reward for his work here, yet he BELIEVES himself not a selfish person because he is a minister in the act of reforming the selfish and criminal. He is not a reformer, because he is selfish, like all persons who can see no good in others, but look to themselves as the example of unselfishness.

The feeling between mother and one child is more selfish because it is not more universal, or bestowed upon ALL ALIKE as it is illustrated by "the good Samaritan". If you will or have observed where the mother and father make the most of a child, you will find that such love—as you call it love—though not a passionate love; it has hindered the child's progress. Also, the father and mother who have done so much for a child, lessens in it the ability it should have to help itself. It produces, generally, a kind of "Mamma's boy and girl", which is proof that such love is not good for the child, and yet, you hear such fathers and mothers call any one "heartless" who objects to their idea, or their "LOVING" their child. I have seen where the parents take, and make less over a child, that such a one grew up and not only respected and helped the parents more than the child who the parents had loved more, but that the child itself gained in ability. The one that is loved

and caressed will never amount to anything much, unless it is able to realize the situation, as it generally will when it is left alone in the world, and overcome in itself what the parents have engrafted in it. Again, I claim this is not Love, but is a selfish feeling, or that they—the parents are trying to make THEMSELVES happy (This is the law of selfishness, to make yourself happy, by believing you are helping some one else) by taking the happiness from others, for it really removes the after life and happiness of the child because of this error which is responsible for the condition of that child when it is not able to grow in self-reliance. You will find and detect here the sense of self, or that you are really making it a SELF LOVE, since it does not promote good, or end in any good for the child, from the very fact that the child does not return the love by helping the parents, but it too, builds its own life after this fashion, and entertains the same love of self. In cases where there are several children of the same family, you will note sometimes this love—selfish desire is given more towards one child than the others, and that this one generally turns out the worst of all. Here we find that Love as it is applied in the Bible refers to AN ACT of Good, or an act of God, while the general expression of the word Love is A feeling, therefore NOT AN ACT of DOING GOOD, because a feeling is derived from the heart. Here you are criticizing me now for claiming that the heart can have no feeling of Good. This is the exact stand I take, for the heart is not capable of rendering anything but that which pertains to selfishness. It is “true to nature” in that it above all is the one organ that is

guided more by nature and self—to satisfy it—than any organ. You claim that man has “a good heart” I argue that it is not true, “For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, and blasphemies”. So, you will observe that the heart is not capable of doing any good, but is the organ guided by the selfishness of mankind. As pointed out before,—when you see an animal looking after its young, it is the law that governs it to look after that which is unable to protect itself, and not necessarily an act of love for the young, because it knows no law of Reason. It is not necessary to have such feelings, or emotions or sympathies all derived from the heart, in order to be good, or to do good—sympathy never acts, it only SAYS, and DOES NOT. You often hear people say “I sympathize with you”, but it never helped any one, because it never fed the hungry, therefore, it is not an act. This emotion and love and sympathetic FEELINGS, are being omitted in all the better plays of to-day, which is also proof of its falling short in doing good. The “melo-drama” with its love-mush (please excuse the phrase, but it is in harmony with the so-called play) generally filling the air until it disgusts the more intelligent, only amuses the few to-day. It is only in keeping with the cheaper grade of novels, of which we used to glory in, but are now loath to read them as we grasp a greater intelligence. I might mention the fact here, that the stage has done and is doing more towards abating evil in all forms, than Religion, because IT IS FREE to EXPRESS ITSELF (the minister seldom is) and consequently assists man to free himself.

“Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God, therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not”. Also, “Love your enemies”. Do good to “your enemies” could hardly be expressed by those who Love as the term love is ordinarily used, nor could these feelings shown between friends and relatives exist or be shown in like manner to “their enemies”, since it could not satisfy SELF if it would look to its enemies. This sense and affection exists the same in man as in woman, but the claim is generally made that “woman’s love is greater”. This would in my opinion then, make the woman more selfish than man. If I were to judge, I would say this is true accordingly, in that she exercises her love more, or is compelled to by a fixed law to do so in order to satisfy herself, than is compelled to do so by man. But, because it is so, it has simply shown more,—not because she is a woman in the case of being a mother to the young, but because nature has placed her so. My idea of this can be better understood by recognizing the fact that from the beginning of the world, it has been the custom of the male to supply food and support for the female and offspring. This separation in going forth to gain this supply, removes from the male the opportunity to exercise the sense and develop the emotional feelings for the wife and children, when, because the wife and children are continually associated with each other, so the sense of feeling is more developed in the wife for the children. It has been my experience and observation that CONTINUED ASSOCIATION breeds this sense of feeling. It

will also breed the opposite—hatred and contempt, whether it be man towards woman, or man towards the wife, or man towards man, and woman towards woman. We are all made equal,—male and female. In every sense, however, we are not brought under the same conditions and circumstances. Because the word man is used so much more than the word woman in the Bible, it has given man some preference. While I can agree with Mr. Ingersoll that the word man is used so much in the Bible is “because the Bible was written by man”, it also alludes to man as significant of both sexes, or neuter gender in particular. We have been taught that GOOD THINGS spring from, or are due to the heart, but we find from the remarks made by Jesus and Paul that it is capable of many THINGS NOT GOOD. If the heart told man what to do, it would be as wise to say that Nature informs God what it shall do,—but the lesser cannot control the greater. Perhaps a very suitable way to illustrate affection, or that the feeling between the male and female is not necessarily love, but passion, is to show where it is liable to end, especially if they are demonstrative in their affection, as shown in the caress or embrace. If a man be addicted to drink, and you give him a glass of wine, he may not feel the effect of it, but let him continue the drink one after another, and the result will be a case of intoxication and evil results, and this is really a lesson that the FIRST ONE should be avoided. So, with embracing and kissing,—the kiss contains the ingredient of desire to satisfy self in some form or other, and will, if continued, grow into an evil desire when practiced by the opposite

sexes, and in many cases, result in evil, though once may not bring the effect. This, again, is proof that it is not "of the spirit", but is "of the flesh" and illustrates the fact that if mothers and fathers did not implant this upon those of their offsprings, that the same would not be inherited by the children and be practiced by them later in life. There is no better teacher than the experience and observation of things, and I aver that there is no difference in the experience of all men and women, though some, to avoid conviction, claim they never could experience such feelings thru such processes, but I acknowledge my experience is no more than some others.

If my heart is made sore by the loss of a friend (in this too, I have experienced these things because there is no one to-day but what is selfish to some extent, and even as Jesus was, because he "wept" on certain occasions) or business, etc., I have in one sense been the cause of its soreness, since I have been guided more by the lower or animal instincts, rather than by a Spiritual Sense of life,—for, IN REALITY, I HAVE NO LOSS, because I am not the Cause or Creator of things, but am under a law of Creation, therefore, they—these things and relatives and the like DO NOT BELONG TO ME. If a mother weeps for the loss of a child, she is doing so thru a lack of knowledge of the law of Creation and things in their order of destruction. Jesus referred to this when he said,—“Follow me and let the dead bury the dead”, which, though it implies much to those he addressed and to us of to-day, they, as well as we fail to know the exact meaning unless we use it as here defined, that is,

observe the fact that weeping over that which is gone is not in accordance with that which will produce good results. The mother looks at the child as HER OWN, and of a necessity weeps for HER OWN,—but knowing the child belongs to Creation which caused ITS OWN TO EXIST, or “Nature working to HER OWN END”,—she should have no claim to weeping. We have often seen as much love—emotion for an adopted child as for the mother’s child, which again shows how this is brought on by continued association, and not because of any blood relation: nor even because of wishing to do good for the child. In your own heart there lies the feeling that you wanted SOMETHING—in this case a child—for yourself, which was a selfish motive to satisfy self. You may not have believed this, nor you may not believe it here when reading of it. But, nevertheless, it is a fact that is proven so by the illustrations brought out to prove it is so against YOUR will. You will note and observe if you will, that where one loves the most—as you call it—that such are MORE SELFISH and MORE PASSIONATE, therefore, associated with the lower senses, or instincts of the animal nature. I have seen where the husband was what may be termed, or the general expression is a “home body”, or lived at home more than the woman, that he displayed more feeling for the children than the woman, showing there exists no more of this feeling—love—in the woman than the man, if they both have the same opportunity to exercise and develop these conditions subject to the heart nature. So I say, he that goeth about weeping over a lost wife, is only making it easier for the next

one—the sympathetic woman hath a large heart, and she “falls” for the same selfish—sympathy that is within the man.

Let us turn here to what extent love in nature may be used, or that, where love for a child may be removed, if, at any time, the selfish nature demands some other form of love in nature, by quoting from Spencer.

“Great love of offspring is ascribed to the New Guinea people,—and yet a man will “barter one or two” with a trader for something he wants. Eyre states that the natives of Australia are characterized by strong parental affection,—and yet, besides being said to desert sick children, Angas asserts of them that on the Murray they will sometimes kill a boy to bait their hooks with his fat. Of the Fuegians we read that they are affectionate towards each other,—and yet that in times of scarcity they kill the old women for food. Keeping this in mind, we shall be aided in reconciling the conflicting accounts of his excessive egotism, and his fellow feeling—his cruelty and kindness”. While this quotation shows “excessive egotism”, it illustrates this in a hereditary form in us, because we know of such cases of extreme kindness in one instant, and of extreme cruelty in another instant being practiced by the same person on another, and that the same can only be improved—not by satisfying self—but by looking to a Higher Ideal of Life as our existence, irrespective of what concerns ourself.

Jesus said,—“And every one that hath forsaken father, or mother, or wife, or children, for my name’s sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and

shall inherit everlasting life". This has given rise to the opinion that man should leave his wife, etc., or that it even refers to a separation by divorce. It simply alludes to the fact that if we give up the Religious opinion held by our "forefathers", or as being in no relation to them only by association for a cause as in nature it must be so, such would open the way to receive the Knowledge of a Higher Life than is revealed by Nature, because it would denote unselfishness in us, and so not relate to the natures of man generally. By giving up such past theories of a life "hereafter", which is "of the flesh"—the opinion derived from the selfish view of "Father, Mother", etc.,—we receive—"inherit everlasting life" HERE. That is, we "inherit" as much as we are able to receive, by looking to a Higher Life here, instead of the flesh view—father and mother—that is generally taught by Religion. We, in the same way "inherit" money for the Physical part of life, only in the proportion that we are able to use it here, since it can only be used here. If the above referred to separation, or divorce, it would contradict the saying,—“For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall CLEAVE TO HIS WIFE”.

The only thing then to do is to affirm the Truth only, that only the Truth shall appear by Manifestation, therefore, it is God—Man—who affirms its own, as also it would be Satan—Man—who affirms its own. So I am in one sense Temporal, "Nevertheless I live, yet NOT I, but Christ liveth in me",—and I live, yet not I, but Satan liveth in me, therefore "I am" nothing, only that Christ is ALL ONE, and "I am" nothing, only that Satan

is ALL ONE, but because I live, so does God and Satan live, yet, I live by them because they live, therefore "I am" God and Satan. But when I "pass away"—die, THEN I am nothing also, because I—form cannot express either life, since, I am then NO FORM OF LIFE, therefore under bond only to SUFFER NOW as much as Satan—Evil—makes of Me, which is only Satan—Me—suffering for HIS OWN. And under bond only to be HAPPY NOW as much as God—Good—makes of Me, which is only God—Me—Being happy for HIS OWN, and I cannot be happy nor suffer any other place or world, because there is no "other world"—Heaven and Hell.

So then, if you find a man is a drunkard, etc., do not blame him, ("I condemn no man", because he is condemned or not to that extent he is subject to that or this), for it is not he that is working, but a conditioned environment which he is subject to, as you are under bond to some like Evil, since in you the Evil is working in some other form, and perhaps more damnable to you than the drink is to him. Besides, the drink will condemn him, as the Evil in another form will condemn you then and there, and the drink Evil is nothing compared to the One Evil Jesus referred to, which is illustrated in the following—

Several years ago while traveling thru Pennsylvania I chanced to be in conversation with a traveling salesman who said: "I detest a drunkard and everything connected with the liquor traffic". Later in the conversation he suggested that that night we "make the rounds". He was a married man but, of course, he only "detested" things concerning

290 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

other people or that which did not interfere with his own so-called pleasure, and so one can imagine there are things other than liquor when abused that will "ruin a home". It is amusing to hear a person indulging in lust, tobacco, drink and the like, say, "I am a Christian", while he looks upon another person with none of the above indulgences, saying, "That fellow is a heathen or an Infidel". In other words, it is the Christian leading most any kind of a life with the excuse that it is only necessary to "believe" in a God as a Being and by praying to the same after each Evil is committed you will be free to "go it again", or it stands to Reason that you will repeat the offense if you can be forgiven by praying. But the other fellow is an Infidel because he does not believe in the same kind of a God, but has all the Christian qualities that the Christian ought to have. No wonder Jesus said to the then and now Pharisees, "O generation of Vipers: how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh".

Jesus said "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come". In other words,—to speak against me as the Son of man, as we talk of one another, will not effect me as to my morality, since I am affected by my own thoughts, and therefore, leaves nothing in its true sense to be "forgiven", or "it shall be forgiven", because I am not subject to what is said against me—"the Son of man"—because there can be no conviction, or I cannot be condemned within myself from what is said of me

nor what is said of one person to another. But to speak against the "Holy Ghost", which is "The Comforter", is to lessen the followers of Truth, and so, cannot "be forgiven", or overlooked in "this world" because it THEN AND THERE hinders the work of God—Thought—in "this world, and "in the world to come", since, "the world to come" CANNOT COME—be present in this world—unless the Truth is recognized in "this world", and so cannot "be forgiven", because sin cannot be forgiven, but should be abolished, when it is THEN AND THERE forgiven, because it is destroyed, but not that it is forgiven. Some will remark by way of excuse,—“How could Jesus have done such mighty works if he was not born of God?” To this ignorant remark, we can reply, “there have been men before and since his time who lived at some time—Paul, for instance—very far from what is right, yet their recognition and understanding of a Higher Life and Power of Thought, have enabled them to do “many wonderful things”—seemingly, if not a fact. If this were not true, then there would be no help for man to rise above Evil conditions, since ALL have erred, even Jesus. To make ourself equal to the Truth he taught, is to make ourselves “equal to God”, and this is the only “salvation” since the average man cannot entertain the idea of a Spiritual Life HERE, because he has failed to recognize the fact that he is only equal to whatever he believes, therefore, their likeness to the Jews in the time of Jesus. It is written,—“Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he had not only broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, mak-

ing himself equal with God". But, as said heretofore, Jesus said "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are Gods?" making all men equal to God.

I predict then, that when man reaches that period—that is, "all men", or state called Spiritual Life which is the Complete Life or State of Perfection, that the propagation period—Natural and Spiritual jointly, or Physical and Mental jointly—will be that end, which is "the end of the world", but not the end of the world as referred to by Theologians and the public in general, for "I came not to destroy, but to save the world". As touching on such a state of existence, we will quote Matthew 19: 11 and 12. "But he said unto them all men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. "For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb, and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it".

In the above quotation we cannot evade the fact that, as in "Natural selection", of the Physical growth of existence, there is also a Spiritual selection in the Mental growth of existence. Not that there are Naturally and Spiritually any SPECIALLY SELECTED PERSONS, as in Religion there seems to be a tendency to believe that God selects certain persons for that or this, or that some are especially selected to master others, or that they are to be educated above others, and to reach heaven above others. But, that because of certain environments, circumstances, and opportunities which may condition that or this person for that or

this, and as to the life he lives, whether it be for Good or for Evil, it is to change the environment and the like which shall change one from Good to Evil, and from Evil to Good, since Thought is condition of environment and the like. Some are physically unfit as well as spiritually unfit, or naturally and mentally so, but not because of the individual or you is it necessarily so. We have "they to whom it is given", because "all men cannot receive this saying", during the marriageable era, since marriage is inevitable so long as such conditions exist. And not that it is specially "given", only, that it is given to those who are "able to receive it". You will note that there are three types of eunuchs. The first signifies an improper birth,—the second signifies one that is made so thru surgery, as in the case of man serving Rulers, etc. The third and most important one, signifies the operation being performed by Thought—God—as in the case of Jesus and Paul, or the Power over the Natural Will as referred to by Paul when he said "he that hath power over his own will" let him remain single. But if not, "let him marry, for it is better to marry than to burn". Jesus was able to say "I have overcome the world" after "THE FAST", but not so before this. Paul later in life, or when he was able to say "I wish all men were even as I myself", was "able to receive it" when he understood, as Jesus, and thru the teaching Jesus gave as "THE TRUTH", and so we need not any more say in the words of Pilate, "WHAT IS TRUTH?" He has made himself a "eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake", refers to one during the marriageable period so that others may

follow after a like fashion. This is in evidence that man is finally to overcome, or give up such relations, for there would be no occasion to use this proverb—man becomes a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake—if such were not true, because it would make the passage NULL and VOID. I can fully understand as Paul did, why "THE NATURAL MAN"—married and single—"knoweth not the things that be of God"—because such things are of Thought and not Natural, and so are "foolishness unto him, for they are spiritually discerned"—they are mentally discerned, while the "Natural man" looks always to the Physical or that which is Natural, and so believes the Mental cannot, at least, in a measure control the Physical because "it is according to nature". It does not have any CHOICE of men nor of women, as Mrs. Eddy seems to think, because Thought only works in persons—"it is God that worketh in you"—which, not being like the individual or individual, but a Unity, has no thought of persons. Neither has Satan—Thought—any choice of men and women, because it is a Unity of Evil. So we cannot be "rewarded" nor "condemned" hereafter for what we as individuals do in a body, if it is "THEY"—God and Satan—"Good and Evil"—that "WORKETH IN YOU", yet we are God and Satan because they work in us as a body. Here again let me remark that it is Reasonable to believe the world has always existed in some form or other, that it shall always exist, ("I came not to destroy but to save the world"), and that it never had a "beginning", since space must always have been and is filled; that something cannot be made

from "nothing", but that this something could exist as solids without having a beginning, from the very fact that existence cannot exist from non-existence, but is because there is a world existence. The only thing then, that has "a beginning" is Life, or "Motion" in the form of life, because any other existence need have no beginning, since only a growth can be associated with a beginning. After millions of years this could develop thru laying dormant by fermentation into different forms of life from the fact that by one body coming in contact with another body forms a growth of one body in another state, just as two acids placed together will produce another or one acid with no seeming relationship. It is a reasonable supposition that the wind having blown the leaves from one location to another, that there these took root and grew up different forms of forests or growths, and also a known fact that forests grew up of the same kind and put to route the forests existing there, just as in all animal life and growth there is a tendency to, or one animal will put to route the other as is also the case of mankind.

It is highly conceivable then that when Thought had developed into a state of Consciousness that there could begin to form a new condition of life, and this has been and is my aim to prove that this, i.e., "the beginning" of what constitutes God and Satan—"Good and Evil" as referred to in Genesis, and thru the development of such Thought of One Only will also be the overcoming of the other Thought and the world which is "THE END" of that world or worldly condition. This assertion places me on the level of what I think, which is the

296 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

Thought "I AM" also, and so to a certain extent places me above the Natural condition. This has been in my experience so, and if it be in my experience so, then it is "the Truth" to me, though it may not be the Truth to you, because it is not in your experience so. It is the natural belief of man, because he is "the natural man", that it—the Natural condition cannot be overcome, since, believing—thinking such—will make it such, for, as "ye believe, so be it done unto you". Belief, is really all there is in life, yet, to believe in another life has nothing to do with another life hereafter, because YOU CANNOT THINK NOW for any life to-morrow, since Thought of to-day cannot work for the to-morrow, because the Thought to-morrow will work for itself. It is impossible to overcome a thing you believe as impossible. The "natural man" as in Religion he is taught has been foolish enough to believe that Jesus lived just to "overcome the world" for us, when we are all subject to the same laws. Neither can it be said with accuracy that Jesus always lived up to what is referred to as overcoming the world, since the natural man was so much more in evidence then, than it is to-day, but that his abstaining—"fasting"—for forty days from the same, illustrates the fact that IT COULD BE OVERCOME, and thru this was he able to prophesy what he believed to be "The Truth", or that God—Thought would in Time destroy these conditions and necessarily bring about a different condition of life. But, as to the Reality of what that life should be, he knew not as he said,—“no man knoweth, not even the Son”, other than what Thought—"God hath prepared for them that love

him"—would be able to produce as a result of this thinking of the same. The teacher of a school is subject to the same as the scholars, and the scholars are subject to the same laws as the teacher. The teacher is only a teacher because of having made more of a study of the problem taught than the scholars to be taught. We lay great stress on all other problems and preach against all other forms of appetite, but avoid the Truth as Jesus taught, lest we convict ourselves. We preach against drink, tobacco and the like, when they should be the last to be considered, that is, if we wish to be free more from diseased conditions, since it is the only cause which will produce a like effect, because a diseased Thought or Evil produces a like diseased bodily condition. Such persons who preach "Sanitary Law" have not worked out of conditions they should work out of, hence they are not an EXAMPLE of the Real Truth, which is proof also that no two persons see alike, and therefore such should not dictate to one another, nor make laws for others. It lies within us to overcome the things in us which are a detriment to us irrespective of what another believes is right or wrong for us. Then will the manufacturer of this or that be put out of business, since there can be no sale for anything if there is no desire and demand. Take, for instance, in every problem of life,—the wild animals become extinct when the woods are cleared away to make room for more civilized conditions. They could not, nor would not breed for fear of being destroyed. The insects do not appear when there is nothing to breed from and attract them. Decayed matter creates worms and the like. When

the swamps and low lands are done away with, or used to better advantage, there will be no cause for the kind of insects which generally live and thrive there. The moth exists because it is natural that things be used or made use of continually, and must be absorbed by some form or other. When cleanliness is THOROUGH, the house will have no room for the insects which generally inhabit it. Fly-paper does not do away with existing conditions; it only attracts insects which exist because of existing conditions. Man is the only living creature having a Conscience, so it is only reasonable to believe that he is the only form of life that can exist forever, or not become extinct, for Thought or God is in the world, that man may be saved from death in the world. This state of existence is referred to in chapter 19, verse 7 of Revelation. "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready". This is in recognition of the fact that man being Conscious of "the Christ"—"the Lamb is come"—and the Truth, which is "His Wife", is ready to be wed—accepted by all persons, for "His wife hath made herself ready", and the "false bride"—Error—is divorced by the Truth. This state is the "New heaven and a new earth", because "The first heaven and the first earth were passed away", thru a better understanding of what heaven and earth signify, and the Thought of the same, as we read in the final chapter of Revelaton.

If you have followed me, or because it is said "God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever",—do you believe the God OF yesterday, is the God

OF to-day? It is to be hoped not, or if you believe it is the same God of to-day, then you have not followed me, since it is by Evolution of Thought from a lesser intelligence that a greater intelligence and Perfection is reached in any problem of life. The Principle of the Evolution of Thought is always the same, and since we, or if we know the Principle, we can work accordingly. And, since there is no other space in which it can exist, though it needs no space as a Principle, it cannot or does not exist as a Reality until it is known by Expression as a Reality. This makes "Predestination" a lie, from the very fact that nothing can be predestined as a result, and that which now exists as a Reality, knows nothing of to-morrow which shall be a different Reality. That is, the candle as light, could not predestine the electric as light, though the Principle of light is the same; but the electric is a different light, therefore a different Reality, yet the candle as light was the only Reality of light in its day. "Thou lovedest me before the foundation of the world", is simply significant of a Principle or anything which cannot be seen by the eye as in Nature things are seen, since Thought, Spirit, Love, Right and Wrong, Good and Evil and Reason cannot be seen only as they are Expressed by the form of man which is man. Man—form is but the PENDULUM swaying as they—Good and Evil works, and therefore not steadfast as One—God. He is, like all forms of life, a kind of "THIRD PART" as referred to in Revelation.

If you did believe, or do believe in Predestination, you cannot have any hope for yourself, from the very fact that if God Predestined it SO AND SO,

300 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

you would not change from a fool to anything better, or a different life, because you are so and so, or thusly. If you have been convinced or not of no Predestination, it is hoped also to convince you that there is no "Regeneration". You ought to be convinced of this, since, as stated, Evolution is by Thought, consequently, Thought cannot return, or there is no Thought to return, but IS, or the Thought of to-day cannot return and take the place of the Thought that IS, or is HERE, because only that Thought which is here can exist as Thought. It cannot return in something else to-morrow, or be born in something else to-morrow, when it and that which did exist by it can go no place, because there is no place—space but as it exists as we see it, only that the body-material returns "to dust". If you have followed me in believing that Thought develops and exists, and man exists and evolves as the Thought exists and develops, then you cannot conceive the idea that ANYTHING RETURNS, as believed also by those who believe "Reincarnation", because we can here say again, that what IS NOW IS, and not that anything can return. For, as the leaf which returns to the earth to replace there the space made vacant by the next leaf, so you likewise—shall return to fill the space left vacant by that body which shall be born to Express this Life. Now, if you have been convinced that there is nothing in Predestination, and nothing in Regeneration, and a Life for you hereafter, then you have been convinced of a Truth, but not "the Truth", since the latter is that "the Christ" is the Idea of Spiritual Life to be lived here. I have only

repeated the unselfish remarks made by Jesus in a different way, but the same meaning, and we should not consider the possible selfish remarks made by him, any more than those made by us, yet we are not responsible for the selfish remarks made, since we are the off-spring of selfish remarks made, or those made by him.

We should not approve of looking back, or to the origin of things, only as a lesson in Evolution on a Physical basis in that it assists in finding the facts of a Spiritual Evolution.

So then, if this thinking of the present only, ("TAKE NO THOUGHT FOR THE MORROW"), and consequently of no God only as a present Thought and so no hereafter, sound unreasonable to my readers or that it can be termed "Infidel",—then I am an Infidel to you, which is no more than that you are an Infidel to me. If one aims to do and live the Christ life here, he or she may be an Infidel in name only, therefore, a Christian in Truth. If one be called a Christian and have no such qualities as Christ, then he or she is a Christian in name only, therefore nothing in Christ, since the name of a thing does not give it its quality, but is qualified to be such by the character lived. But one cannot claim to be a Real Christian—Christ in Truth, because no man can live a Christ Life, in its Absolute form to-day, and Jesus did not, because the word Jesus signifies the Natural Life, but finally "they" will "ALL be CHRIST'S—many in the one name—Christ, and not man as Jesus. The Philosophy of Christianity is a Truth, just as the Philosophy of Socialism is a Truth, but you can

302 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

no more be a Christian to-day, than you could be a Socialist, other than in name. Not wishing to bring Socialism in connection with the subject, I trust you will overlook the remark, since it is a subject in itself, and has no relationship to Christianity. Socialism deals with the Material and Physical life and so is related only to the Natural Law, while Christianity deals with the Mental and Spiritual Life and so is related only to the Spiritual Law of Life. However, they are associated with each other because of the existing conditions. Christ deals with the Spiritual as related to the Mental working to destroy the organs of desire and appetite, while the Socialist deals with the system of the distribution of profits, and that which concerns the body, instead of the Real Soul.

I argue that this is The Higher Evolution because it is above the Evolution of man in the Physical. The latter or "man from a monkey", very rightly derives its name from the beginning of formation with no Sense of Cause, since there could have been no Sense of Cause, and therefore no Cause for anything until a knowledge of this or that developed. In the whole sum and substance of it all there can be no mistake but that Thought is to develop the Higher condition, or that only thru Thought can the Material conditions be overcome. So then, If I am right in this, and thru this idea I have told of things that are proper, then you cannot condemn me for my sayings, simply because I do not "believe" in the same kind of a God you believe in. But I have a right to believe in "What is Truth", because in my experience I have proved it is so.

“And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine. “For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes”.

What is “authority?” and how do we as a rule receive it? To be the author and authority of a given thing is TO KNOW, and to know a thing is to experience that thing, since you cannot be authority for anything you cannot prove. Jesus did not prove anything but what he experienced in life, and that is all any one should be expected to prove, since, anything hereafter is generally a selfish view of which we know Jesus entertained at times, which resulted in selfish words he spoke, while what he proved was by what he lived and the only thing he had authority on. “The scribes” taught from mere belief, as all Religious doctrines are generally taught from what is supposed to be a fact, and not that it is so thru experience. You preach there is a Hell; then we should demand that you go to the bottom and find it, and you preach there is a Heaven; then you should invent some scheme to find it, because it is no more than Reasonable that you “deliver the goods”, if we are willing to make the purchase—sacrifice things to attain it. It will then be proved because you have “authority”. We are disgusted with buying “gold bricks” and “watered stock”, only to find that we have been swindled. If I speak “as one having authority”, it is because I can prove by actual experience what I do know, and not what I “believe”, for I too, may believe something I do not know. Perhaps you are like the “Professor” who wants “ten million dol-

lars in order to talk with Mars ". Perhaps his " pipe will go out " before he receives it, or the people will AWAKE to the fact that the Professor is looking out for himself, or that many like " discoveries " are " pulled off " on the ignorant public, by those who wish to earn an easy living. So you too, should WAKE UP before it is too late to enjoy the Heaven you and others can make HERE, and not suffer the Hell you and others make here. If you will spend more time and money in this—your own country " saving souls ", as you call it, than in foreign " missionary " work; you will note BETTER RESULTS IN THE FOREIGN COUNTRIES, than you can experience to-day under the present system. If you " save yourself " as the people wanted Jesus to do, the foreigner will have SOME AUTHORITY FOR BELIEVING YOU, or would have an EXAMPLE of the Truth. But when you represent a country that builds for war and fight,—LAND GRAB AND THE LIKE, you cannot expect to be the example of any Truth. They do not appreciate the idea that unless they repent and reform, that they will go to Hell, as we have tried and do try to preach to them, while we are doing more against what is termed a sin than they, and not alone in this, but in keeping our fellow man from more than obtaining a mere existence. No wonder they return " EVIL FOR EVIL ", which same is now cropping out in some of the foreign countries.

We spend more time and money to reach the IMPOSSIBLE, than for that which IS POSSIBLE HERE. " Everything is possible with God ", but we find some things are impossible " with God " if

it has no connection with the Principle of Good. It all depends on how you use the word "possible". It is impossible for God to get Good out of Evil, but "everything is possible with God" is the Truth, because the Truth IS "WITH GOD".

So then, you find fault with me because my fault is not yours, and not because I am at fault. The same doctrine Jesus taught is found fault with to-day, because we are as SELFISH AS THEY, or want to LIVE FOREVER. Does this not smack of selfishness in its worst form? It is as much as to say "if I had my way about things, no one else would live forever", which is analogous to the fact that there exists a class who keep this in vogue. We are just as selfish about our Religion as in other walks of life, and this is why it is not the true Doctrine, and therefore unscientific.

I will conclude by asking a reasonable hearing, at least from those who have sought and not found that which is elevating and satisfying. It only requires a few to keep the Truth from going into oblivion, as in the case of all Scientific truths it is so, until "ALL MEN" are "ABLE TO RECEIVE IT". It is of no use, and of course, unreasonable to argue with those who are satisfied, for, to be satisfied is THE GREATEST THING IN THE WORLD, yet, it does not hold good that such is the Truth, since Jesus had to do things that were not exactly as satisfactory as he wished them. Jesus said never to argue the Truth with any one satisfied, but talk it to those who care to hear it, for, it is better to "AGREE WITH THINE ADVERSARY WHILEST THOU ART IN THE WAY WITH HIM", since discord only breeds hatred,—and wise

306 THE HIGHER EVOLUTION

is that person who will not "GIVE THAT WHICH IS HOLY UNTO SWINE, LEST THEY TURN AND REND YOU", which is to signify that you make more enemies to talk that which is "holy" as you believe it to be so, to those who cannot receive it as you see it is so. The same fault is found with the Truth by the priests and people to-day as of old, but these must finally fall into the ONE rank of the ONE DOCTRINE, which is Christ as the Idea of life to be here lived, instead of the "many Christs"—Creeds who teach that Christ is to appear "AGAIN" in the form of Jesus as "the Christ".

"Then said Pilate to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man".

THE END.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 088 161 2

